COLLECTION OF PURITAN AND
ENGLISH THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE

LIBRARY OF THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

SCC
9235

A. Alexande

A VINDICATION OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE *Holy and Ever Blessed* TRINITY, AND THE INCARNATION OF The Son of God.

OCCASIONED

By the Brief NOTES on the Creed of St. *Athanasius*, and the Brief HISTORY of the *Unitarians*, or *Socinians*; and containing an ANSWER to both.

By *WILLIAM SHERLOCK*, D. D.
Dean of St. PAUL's, Master of the TEMPLE, and Chaplain in Ordinary to Their MAJESTIES.

The Third Edition.

IMPRIMATUR,
Jan. 9. 1690. *Z. Isham*, R. P. D. *Henrico* Episc. Lond. à Sacris.

LONDON,
Printed for W. Rogers, at the *Sun*, over-against St. *Dunstan*'s Church, in *Fleet-street*, 1694.

TO THE

READER.

I Will make no Apology for publiſhing this Vindication of the Great and Fundamental Myſteries of our Religion, for if ever it were neceſſary, it is now, when Atheiſts and Hereticks, ſome openly, ſome under a diſguiſe, conſpire together to ridicule the Trinity, and the Incarnation.

I confeſs, the Book is too big, could I have made it leſs, as at firſt I intended; but when I was once engaged, I ſaw a neceſſity of going farther; and I hope no Man will have reaſon to complain, that I have ſaid too much, but thoſe, who will find a great deal too much ſaid, for them to anſwer.

My Original Deſign was to vindicate the Doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation, from thoſe pretended Abſurdities and Contradictions, which were ſo confidently charged on them: And this I'm ſure I have done; for I have given a very eaſie aud intelligible Notion of a Trinity in Unity, and if it be poſſible to explain this Doctrine intelligibly, the Charge of Contradictions vaniſhes; and whether Men will believe this Account or not, they can't deny, but that it is very poſſible and intelligible, and if we could go no farther, that is enough in Matters of Revelation.

But I hope, I have done a great deal more than this, and proved, That it is the true Scripture Account of

it, and agreeable to the Doctrine of the Ancient Fathers; and have vindicated the Scripture-Proofs of a Trinity and Incarnation from the pitiful Sophistries of the late Socinian *Historian.*

I have not indeed answered particularly the whole Book in Order and Method, as it lies, which was too tedious a Work, and not necessary; but I have considered whatever was most material in it, and have avoided nothing, because it was hard to answer, but because it needed no answer, as I am ready to satisfie the World, whenever a just Occasion calls for it: For having dipt my Pen in the Vindication of so glorious a Cause, by the Grace of God, I will never desert it, while I can hold a Pen in my Hand.

I must thankfully own, that the writing of this Book has given me clearer and more distinct Notions of this Great Mystery, than I had before, which is the Reason, why the Reader will find some things explained towards the end, which I spoke doubtfully of at first, as particularly the difference between the Eternal Generation of the Son, and the Procession of the Holy Ghost; and I hope this is a pardonable Fault.

The writing this Book has cost me many Thoughts, and those who have a mind throughly to understand it, must not think much if it cost them some; and if they cannot be contented to bestow some serious Thoughts on it, it will be lost labour to read it. I pray God give success to it, and open the Eyes of those Men, before it be too late, who are so industrious to write or disperse such Brief Notes and Brief Histories, as are valuable for nothing but Blasphemy and Nonsense; for I will be bold to say, That Socinianism *(after all its pretences to Reason) is one of the most stupid sensless Heresies, that ever infested the Christian Church.*

THE

THE CONTENTS.

SECT. I. *Concerning the Nature of a Contradiction, and how to know it.* Page 1

Many Contradictions pretended, where there are none, as in the Notion of a Spirit, and of God. 3

How to discover when a pretended Contradiction is not real, but in our imperfect Conception of things. 4

It is absurd to dispute against the Being of any thing from the difficulty of conceiving it. 5

What the natural Boundaries of Humane Knowledge are. 9

SECT. II. *The* Athanasian *Creed contains nothing but what is necessary to the true Belief of the Trinity and Incarnation.* 10

The Dispute between the Greek *and* Latin *Church, about the* Filioque. 17

SECT. III. *Concerning the necessity of the Catholick Faith to Salvation, and a Brief History of* Athanasius. 21

That the Catholick Faith is necessary to Salvation. 25

What is meant by keeping the Catholick Faith whole and undefiled. 28

The Scriptures being a compleat Rule of Faith, do not make Athanasius's *Creed an unnecessary Rule.* 29

The great usefulness of ancient Creeds. 31

Pope Leo III. *would not deny Salvation to those who disowned the* Filioque. 33

What is meant by the Catholick Faith. 35

The History of Athanasius. 37

SECT. IV. *The Catholick Doctrine of a Trinity in Unity, and Unity and Trinity, explained and Vindicated from all pretended Absurdities and Contradictions.* 45

What it is that makes any Substance numerically One. 48

The Unity of a Spirit nothing else but Self-consciousness. ibid.

And

And therefore mutual conſciouſneſs makes Three Perſons eſſentially and numerically One. Page 49
The unity of a Mind or Spirit reaches as far as its Self-conſciouſneſs does. 50
That this is the true Scripture Notion of the Unity of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt. ibid.
The Unity between Father and Son explained. 51
The Union of created Spirits, an Union in Knowledge, Will and Love. 52
The ſame Union between Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt. ibid.
But this, which is only a moral Union between Creatures, is an eſſential Union between Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, as it is the effect of mutual Conſciouſneſs. 55
This proved from Scripture, as to the Unity between Father and Son. 56
This makes all Three Divine Perſons coeſſential and coequal. 58
That the Holy Spirit is One with Father and Son by a mutual Conſciouſneſs, proved from Scripture. 64
This Notion contains the true Ortohdox Faith of a Trinity in Unity. 66
For it does not confound the Perſons, but makes them diſtinct. ibid.
Nor divide the Subſtance, but makes them numerically One. 68
This makes the Doctrine of the Trinity as intelligible as the Notion of One God. ibid.
The material Images of Subſtance confound our Notions, both of One God, and of a Trinity in Unity. 69
God muſt be conſidered as Eternal Truth and Wiſdom. 70
Wiſdom and Truth a pure and ſimple Act, and contains all Divine Perfections. 71
Three infinite Minds muſt neceſſarily be mutually conſcious to each other. 74
No poſitive Notion of Infinity, but only in a Mind. 75
No infinite Extenſion. 76
What the true Notion of Infinite is, that it is abſolute Perfection. 78
That there are no abſolute Perfections, but thoſe of a Mind. 79
Extenſion is no Perfection, nor to be Omnipreſent by Extenſion. 80
The ſame abſolute Perfections of a Mind, by a mutual Conſciouſneſs, may be entire and equal in Three infinite Minds. 81

This reconciles the perfect equality and subordination of the Divine Persons. Page ibid.
And shows, how each Person is God, and all but One God. 82
This gives an Account of the different modi subsistendi, *of which the Schools speak.* 83
And how the Operations of the Trinity ad extra *are common to all Three Persons.* 85
An Answer to the Absurdities and Contradictions charged on the Doctrine of the Trinity by the Brief Notes. 87
SECT. V. *The Doctrine of the Fathers and Schools about a Trinity in Unity, reconciled to the foregoing Explication of it.* 100
That the Fathers made the Three Divine Persons Three distinct infinite Minds. 101
That Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are as distinct Persons as Peter, James, *and* John, *how to be understood.* 104
How the Fathers Explain the Unity of the Godhead. 105
1. *By the* ὁμοουσιότης *or coessentiality of the Divine Persons.* 106
What they meant by the ὁμοουσιότης. ibid.
How they proved the Unity of Essence from the sameness of Nature. Gregory Nyssen's *reasoning in this matter, and vindicated from the Misrepresentation of* Petavius *and Dr.* Cudworth. 109.&c.
2. *To this the Fathers added a Numerical Unity of the Divine Essence* 121
Concerning the Unity of Energy and Power. 123
The ἀνεγχώρησις *or Circumincession is Self-consciousness.* 125
St. Austin *explains the Unity of the Divine Persons by Examples of Self-consciousness.* 126
The Unity of the Godhead consists in the Unity of Principle. 128
How the Three Divine Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are essential to the Notion of One God, explained at large. 129.&c.
SECT. VI. *Concerning expounding Scripture by Reason.* 140
The Arguments against a Trinity in the History of the Unitarians, *Letter* 1. *particularly answered.* 153.&c.
His first Argument. 154
His second Argument. 155
1 Coloss. 17. *The first-born of every Creature explained.* 156
The Mediatory Kingdom of Christ explained at large. 159
His third, fourth, and fifth Arguments answered. 176
His sixth Argument. 178

His

His seventh Argument. Page 184
His eighth Argument from those Texts, which declare that the Father only is God. ibid.
His ninth Argument, that if Christ were God, there was no need of giving the Holy Spirit to his Human Nature. 187
His tenth and eleventh Arguments. 188
His Arguments against the Godhead of the Holy Ghost. ibid.
Concerning the Personality of the Holy Ghost. 189
That the Spirit is obtained of God by our Prayers, therefore it self is not God, Answered. 193
Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, the entire Object of Worship. 193
Those who do not worship the Trinity, do not worship the true God, if Father, Son, and Holy Ghost be God. 194
No need of any new Command to worship the Holy Ghost, when it is revealed, that he is One God with the Father and Son. ibid.
That the Scripture speaks of God as One Person, Answered. 196
Whether the Socinian *Faith be a reasonable and accountable Faith.* 198
The Socinian *Faith ridicules the Scriptures.* 199
This is particularly shown in the Expositions of Scripture, contained in the History of the Unitarians. ibid
The Form of Baptism in the Name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, explained. 209
1 John 1, 2. *In the beginning was the Word,* &c. *explained and vindicated.* 215
How this Historian has represented Grotius. 220
Socinianism *makes the Jewish Oeconomy very unreasonable and unaccountable.* 231
Socinianism *ridicules the Christian Religion.* 238
SECT. VII. *An Answer to what remains in the Brief Notes.* 256
Concerning the Generation of the Son. ibid
The equality and coeternity of the Persons in the Trinity. 259
Concerning the Incarnation. 262
How an infinite and finite Being may be united into one Person. 263
What makes a Personal Union. 266

A

VINDICATION

Of the DOCTRINE

OF THE

Holy and Ever Bleſſed TRINITY,

AND OF THE

Incarnation of the SON of GOD,

In ANSWER to the Brief NOTES on the Creed of St. *Athanaſius.*

SECT. I.

Concerning the Nature of a Contradiction, and how to know it.

BEFORE I particularly Examine *the Brief Notes on* Athanaſius's *Creed*, which under a pretence of expoſing that Creed, charge the Chriſtian Faith it ſelf *of Three Perſons and One God*, with the moſt monſtrous Abſurdities and Contradictions: I ſhall, 1. Shew what a Contradiction is, and in what Caſes we can judge of a Contradiction. 2. I ſhall take a brief view of the *Athanaſian* Creed,

and ſhew that it ſignifies no more than that there are Three Perſons and One God, or a Trinity in Unity, and Unity in Trinity; and that if we own this, we muſt own the particular Explications of the *Athanaſian* Creed.

Firſt, As for the firſt: A Contradiction is to deny and affirm the ſame thing in the ſame ſenſe; as to ſay; that a thing is, and is not at the ſame time; that there is but One God, and that there are Three Gods; that is, that there is, and that there is not, but One God; for if there be Three Gods, then it is not true that there is only One God: Things which are ſo contrary as to contradict each other, can never be both true, for all Contradictions finally reſolve into this: It is, and It is not; which is abſolutely impoſſible.

But when we come to apply this to the nature of Things, we may eaſily fancy Contradictions where there are none: For a Contradiction in the nature of Things, is ſuch a Notion or Idea of any thing as implies a Contradiction; and then it is impoſſible any ſuch thing can be, as it is impoſſible, that ſuch a Propoſition whoſe terms contradict each other ſhould be true: But then before we can pronounce, that ſuch a Notion or Idea is contradictious, we muſt be ſure, that we perfectly underſtand and comprehend the nature of that Being; otherwiſe the Contradiction may not be in the thing, but in our manner of conceiving it: It is not enough in this Caſe to ſay, we cannot underſtand it, and know not how to reconcile it; but we muſt ſay, that we do perfectly underſtand it, and know that it cannot be reconciled.

As

As for inſtance: Some new Philoſophers will tell you, that the Notion of a Spirit, or an immaterial Subſtance is a Contradiction; for by Subſtance they underſtand nothing but Matter, and then an immaterial Subſtance is immaterial Matter, that is, Matter and no Matter, which is a Contradiction: But yet this does not prove an immaterial Subſtance to be a Contradiction, unleſs they could firſt prove, that there is no Subſtance, but Matter; and that they cannot conceive any other Subſtance but Matter, does not prove, that there is no other.

Thus the Atheiſt diſcovers a great many Contradictions or Abſurdities in the very Notion and Idea of a God, or *of an Eternal, Omnipreſent, Omnipotent, Omniſcient Being.* For to be without a cauſe, and without a beginning, without time, and without ſucceſſion; to be preſent every where, and to fill all Places, and yet to have no parts, no extenſion; to be able to create a World, and to annihilate it again, to make all things of nothing, and to reduce all things to nothing again; to know all things, paſt, preſent, and to come, eſpecially the moſt contingent Futurities, the freeſt Thoughts and Counſels of Men, before they think them, or ſome Ages before they themſelves are in being, without impoſing a Fatal Neceſſity on Humane Actions; I ſay, the Notion of ſuch a Being is very much above our conception; and to an Atheiſt, who is for believing nothing, but what he can fully comprehend, ſeems very abſurd and contradictious.

This ſhews, that Men may eaſily miſtake in charging the Nature and Notions of Things with Contradictions, and therefore we muſt enquire, how we may diſcover, when ſuch an appearing Contradiction

is not real, but is wholly owing to our imperfect conception of things.

I. Now in the first place we have great reason to suspect this, when it relates to such things as all Mankind agree, we do not, and cannot fully understand or comprehend; for it is a vain and arrogant presumption to say what is, or what is not a Contradiction, when we confess, we do not understand or comprehend the thing we speak of: A Contradiction in the Nature of Things, is what is contrary to the Nature of that Being of which we speak: Now so far as we understand the Nature of any Being, we can certainly tell what is contrary and contradictious to its Nature: As that Accidents should subsist without their subject, that a Body should be without extension, or an organized Body without any distinction of Parts; that the same individual Body should be in Heaven and on Earth, and in a thousand distant places at the same time; that Flesh and Blood should lie invisible under the Species of Bread and Wine; that a Body, suppose of five or six Foot long, should be concealed under the least crum of Bread; these and such like are the manifest Absurdities and Contradictions of Transubstantion; and we know that they are so, because we know the Nature of a Body, and know that such things are a Contradiction to the Essential Properties of a Body: But now all Men must confess, that they have not a clear and comprehensive Notion of the Nature and Essential Properties of a Spirit, especially of an infinite Spirit, as God is; and it is impossible to know, what is contrary to the Nature of a Spirit, if we know not, what the Nature of a Spirit is; and that Man, who shall pretend to comprehend all that is possible in an infinite Nature, is as contemptibly

temptibly ridiculous, as if he ſhould challenge to himſelf infinite Knowledge, for without that, no Man can comprehend what is infinite.

II. It is a ſufficient proof, that ſuch ſeeming Contradictions are not in the nature of things, but in our imperfect manner of conceiving them, when we have other evident proofs, that the thing is, though we cannot comprehend it: For nothing can be, which involves a Contradiction in its nature, and therefore if it is, the Contradiction is not real, but imaginary. As for inſtance: As unconceivable as the Notion of Eternity is, yet all Mankind, even Atheiſts themſelves, muſt confeſs, that ſomething was from Eternity; for if ever there was nothing, it is impoſſible there ever ſhould have been any thing; for that which once was not, can never be without a Cauſe, and therefore whatever Difficulties there may be in the Notion of an Eternal Being, we muſt acknowledge ſomething Eternal, and that is proof enough, that there is nothing abſurd or contradictious in the Notion, though we cannot comprehend it; and I am ſure the Notion of a firſt Eternal Cauſe, is much more eaſie and natural, than to make either Matter, or the World, and all the Creatures in it Eternal. Whatever we can certainly prove to be, either by Senſe, Reaſon, or Revelation, if there be any difficulty in conceiving it, we muſt attribute that to the imperfection of our own Knowledge, not to any Abſurdity or Contradiction in the thing it ſelf.

This ſhews how unreaſonable that Method is, which is taken by Atheiſts, Infidels, and Hereticks, to diſpute againſt the Being of any thing from the difficulty of conceiving it, and ſome pretended Abſurdities and Contradictions in it, when there are very plain

plain proofs that the thing is, and ſuch as it is impoſſible for them fairly to anſwer; this is the fundamental Miſcarriage, which is not owing to a prudent Caution, as is pretended, but to wilfulneſs and obſtinacy, and pride of Underſtanding, or to a fixed prejudice and averſion to the belief of ſuch Matters, and therefore I ſhall not only obſerve, but particularly prove the unreaſonableneſs of it.

The proof of this comes to this one Point, That we may have ſufficient Evidence of the Being of a Thing, whoſe Nature we cannot conceive and comprehend; he who will not own this, contradicts the Senſe and Experience of Mankind; and he who confeſſes this, and yet rejects the belief of that, which he has good evidence for, meerly becauſe he cannot conceive it, is a very abſurd and ſenſleſs Infidel.

And the reaſon of this is very plain, becauſe all the Ways whereby the Being of any thing can be proved, are obvious and intelligible to all Mankind; but the Nature of moſt things are very dark and obſcure, and ſuch as the wiſeſt Men know little or nothing of: And therefore we may certainly know, that a great many things are, whoſe Nature and eſſential Properties we cannot conceive: As to ſhew this particularly.

1. The Proofs that any thing is, are either from Senſe, from Reaſon, or from Revelation. What is evident to Senſe, is evident to all Men, who have their Senſes; what is plainly proved by Reaſon (and it is not a ſufficient Proof, if it be not plain) is plain to all Men, who can uſe their Reaſon; and what is plainly revealed every Man may know, who can read and underſtand the Scriptures; the Being and Nature of things are known very different ways, and the

the Being of things not only may, but moſt commonly is known without knowing their natures: Any Man may know the firſt, but few Men in any meaſure can know the ſecond: Whoever has his Senſes about him, knows that there are ſuch things, as he ſees, hears, or feels, but the Philoſophy of Nature is not learnt by Senſe: Reaſon will convince us by ſome viſible and ſenſible Effects, that there are ſome inviſible Cauſes, without informing us diſtinctly, what the Nature and Powers of ſuch Cauſes are; and God may and does reveal many things to us, which we either are not capable of fully Comprehending, or the Nature of which he does not think fit particularly to explain to us; and in all theſe Caſes we may certainly know, that things are, without underſtanding the Nature and Philoſophy of them.

2. It is ſo far from being a wonder to meet with any thing, whoſe Nature we do not perfectly underſtand, that I know nothing in the World, which we do perfectly underſtand: It is agreed by all Men, whoever conſidered this Matter, that the Eſſences of Things cannot be known, but only their Properties and Qualities: The World is divided into Matter, and Spirit, and we know no more, what the ſubſtance of Matter, than what the ſubſtance of a Spirit is, though we think we know one, much better than the other: We know thus much of Matter, that it is an extended Subſtance, which fills a ſpace, and has diſtinct parts, which may be ſeparated from each other, that it is ſuſceptible, of very different qualities, that it is hot or cold, hard or ſoft, *&c.* but what the ſubſtance of Matter is, we know not: And thus we know the eſſential Properties of a Spirit; that it is a thinking Subſtance, with the Faculties of Underſtanding and Will,

Will, and is capable of different Vertues or Vices, as Matter is of ſenſible qualities, but what the ſubſtance of a Spirit is, we know no more than what the ſubſtance of Matter is:

Thus as for the eſſential Properties, Operations, and Powers, of Matter, Sence, Experience, and Obſervation will tell us what they are, and what Cauſes conſtantly produce ſuch Effects, and this is all we do, or can know of it; and he who will not believe that Matter is extended, that the Fire burns, that Water may be condenſed by Froſt into a firm and ſolid Pavement, that Seed ſown in the Earth will produce its own kind again, that a Body can move from one place to another; that a Stone falls to the Ground, and Vapours aſcend and thicken into Clouds, and fall down again to the Earth in gentle Showers, *&c.* I ſay, he who will not believe theſe things till he can give a Philoſophical account of them, muſt deny his Senſes in complement to his Underſtanding; and he who thinks, that he does underſtand theſe matters, would make a Man queſtion, whether he has any Senſe.

Thus it is alſo with reference to a Spirit: We feel within our ſelves, that we can think and reaſon, that we can chooſe and refuſe, that we can love and hate, and deſire and fear, but what theſe natural Powers and Paſſions are, we know not; how Thoughts riſe in our Minds, and how one Thought begets another; how a Thought can move our Bodies, or fix them in their Seat; how the Body can raiſe Thoughts and Paſſions in the Soul, or the Thoughts and Paſſions of the Soul can affect the Body: The Properties and Operations both of Bodies and Spirits are great Secrets and Myſteries in Nature, which we underſtand nothing

nothing of, nor are concerned to underſtand them, no more than it is our buſineſs to underſtand, how to make either a Body or a Spirit; which we have no power to do, if we did underſtand it, and therefore it would be an uſeleſs piece of Knowledge, which would ſerve no end but curioſity; and that is reaſon enough, why our wiſe Maker ſhould not communicate this Knowledge to us, were we capable of it, becauſe it does not belong to our Natures; as no Knowledge does which we can make no uſe of: The perfect Notions and Idea's of Things are proper only to that Almighty Mind, which can give Being to them.

Now this plainly ſhews, what the Natural Boundaries of Humane Knowledge are; how far we may attain to a certain Knowledge, and where we muſt give off our Enquiries, unleſs we have a mind to impoſe upon our Underſtandings with ſome uncertain and fanciful Conjectures, or to perplex our ſelves with inexplicable Difficulties.

1. As firſt we have certain ways of diſcovering the being of Things, which fall within the compaſs of our Knowledge; this our Senſes, Reaſon, or Revelation, will acquaint us with, and therefore we may know what Things there are in the World, as far as they fall under the notice of Senſe, or are diſcovered by Reaſon or Revelation.

2. We may know what things are, or what their eſſential Properties, Qualities, Operations, and Powers are, whereby we can diſtinguiſh one ſort of Beings from another; as ſuppoſe, a Body from a Spirit, Bread from Fleſh, and Wine from Blood; and can reaſon from Effects to Cauſes, and from Cauſes to Effects, with as great certainty as we underſtand, what the Cauſes or Effects are.

3. But the Eſſences of Things, and the Philoſophy of their Natures, the Reaſons of their Eſſential Properties and Powers, which immediately reſult from their Natures, the manner of their Production, and the manner of their Operations, are Myſteries to us, and will be ſo, do what we can; and therefore here our Enquiries muſt ceaſe, if we enquire wiſely; for it is vain and abſurd to perplex our ſelves, with ſuch Queſtions, which we can no more anſwer, than we can make a World.

The ſumm is this, when we charge any Doctrine with Abſurdities and Contradictions, we muſt be ſure, that we underſtand the thing; for if it be ſuch a thing, as we do not, and cannot underſtand the Nature of, we may imagine a thouſand Abſurdities and Contradictions, which are owing wholly to our Ignorance of Things.

SECT. II.

The Athanaſian *Creed contains nothing but what is neceſſary to the true Belief of the Trinity and Incarnation.*

II. LET us now take a view of the *Athenaſian* Creed, which this prophane Author makes the Subject of his Drollery and Ridicule; and examine, whether there be any thing in it, which a good Catholick Chriſtian can reject, without rejecting the Catholick Doctrines of the Holy and Ever Bleſſed TRINITY, and the Myſterious Incarnation of the SON of GOD; for if this Creed contains nothing but what is neceſſary to this belief, and what every Chriſtian who believes theſe Doctrines muſt profeſs, then all theſe Scoffs, which are caſt upon the *Athanaſian* Creed, do indeed

indeed belong to the Chriſtian Faith it ſelf, if the Trinity and Incarnation be Chriſtian Doctrines.

As to begin with the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity. The *Athanaſian* Creed tells us: *The Catholick Faith is this, that we worſhip One God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity:* That is, that we worſhip One God, and Three Perſons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt; and this all Chriſtians grant to be the Catholick Faith, except *Arians*, *Macedonians*, and *Socinians*, and ſuch like Hereticks: And how we muſt worſhip One God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity, is explained in the next Paragraph.

Neither confounding the Perſons, nor dividing the Subſtance.

Which muſt be acknowledged, if there be Three Perſons and One God: For if we confound the Perſons, by ſaying, that they are all but One Perſon under Three different Names and Titles, or Denominations, then we deſtroy the Diſtinction of Perſons; if we divide the Subſtance, by ſaying, that every Perſon has a ſeparate Divine Nature of his own, as every Man has a ſeparate Humane Nature, then we make Three Gods, as *Peter*, *James*, and *John*, are Three Men, which is to overthrow the Doctrine of One God; and therefore the Creed adds,

For there is One Perſon of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghoſt;

But the God head of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt is all One; the Glory equal, the Majeſty co-eternal.

This is ſo far from being a Nicity, that it is no leſs than a Demonſtration, if we confeſs Three Perſons and One God; for if there be Three Perſons, then the Perſon of the Father, the Perſon of the Son, the Perſon of the Holy Ghoſt, muſt be diſtinct Perſons, or they cannot be Three; if there be but One God, then the Godhead of all the Three Perſons is but One, for if the Godhead were more than One, there muſt be more than One God; for the Godhead makes the God, and there muſt be as many Gods, as there are Godheads; as there muſt be as many Men as there are particular Humane Natures: And if the Godhead be but One, then with reſpect to the ſame One Godhead, all Three Perſons muſt have the ſame Glory and Majeſty; for there cannot be Three different Glories and Majeſties of the ſame One Godhead; and therefore as it follows:

Such as the Father is, ſuch is the Son, and ſuch is the Holy Ghoſt.

The Father Uncreate, the Son Uncreate, and the Holy Ghoſt Uncreate.

The Father Incomprehenſible, the Son Incomprehenſible, the Holy Ghoſt Incomprehenſible.

The Father Eternal, the Son Eternal, and the Holy Ghoſt Eternal.

And yet they are not Three Eternals, but One Eternal.

As alſo there are not Three Incomprehenſibles, nor Three Uncreated; but One Uncreated, and One Incomprehenſible.

So likewiſe the Father is Almighty, the Son Almighty, and the Holy Ghoſt Almighty.

And

And yet there are not Three Almighties, but One Almighty.

So the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghoſt is God.

And yet there are not Three Gods, but One God.

So likewiſe the Father is Lord, the Son Lord, and the Holy Ghoſt Lord.

And yet not Three Lords, but one Lord.

For like as we are compelled by the Chriſtian Verity, to acknowledge every Perſon by himſelf to be God and Lord.

So are we forbidden by the Catholick Religion, to ſay, there are Three Gods, or Three Lords.

This is the ſumm of all, That as the Catholick Religion, both Natural, Moſaical, and Chriſtian, requires us to believe, that there is but One God, ſo eſpecially the Chriſtian Religion teaches us, that there are Three Divine Perſons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, who are this One God. Now if each Perſon with reſpect to the ſame Divine Nature be God, then all the eſſential Attributes and Perfections of a God muſt be allowed to each Perſon; that he is Uncreated, Infinite, or Incomprehenſible, Eternal, Almighty God and Lord; unleſs we will ſay, that there may be a Created, Finite, Temporal, Impotent God; that is, a God, who is not in truth either God or Lord: and yet though we muſt acknowledge each Perſon to be God and Lord, we muſt not aſſert Three diſtinct Uncreated, Incomprehenſible, Eternal, Almighty Gods (which is the true Sence of the Article, of which more anon) for that is to make not One, but Three Gods and Lords, which overthrows the Unity of the Godhead.

Now

Now whatever difficulty there may be in conceiving this (which I do not now diſpute) if that be any fault, it is no fault of the *Athanaſian* Creed, but of the Doctrine of the Trinity it ſelf; the *Athanaſian* Creed only tells us what we muſt believe, if we believe a Trinity in Unity, Three Perſons and One God: And I challenge any Man, who ſincerely profeſſes this Faith, to tell me, what he can leave out of this Expoſition, without deſtroying either the Divinity of ſome of the Three Perſons, or the Unity of the Godhead. If each Perſon muſt be God and Lord, muſt not each Perſon be Uncreated, Incomprehenſible, Eternal, Almighty? If there be but One God, and One Lord, can there be Three ſeparated Uncreated, Incomprehenſible, Eternal, Almighty Gods! which muſt of neceſſity be Three Gods, and Three Lords: This Creed does not pretend to explain, how there are Three Perſons, each of which is God, and yet but One God, (of which more hereafter) but only aſſerts the Thing, that thus it is, and thus it muſt be, if we believe a Trinity in Unity; which ſhould make all Men, who would be thought neither *Arians*, nor *Socinians*, more cautious how they expreſs the leaſt diſlike of the *Athanaſian* Creed, which muſt either argue, that they condemn it, before they underſtand it, or that they have ſome ſecret diſlike to the Doctrine of the Trinity.

Nor is this to make any additions to the Chriſtian Faith, as ſome object, no more than to explain what we mean by GOD is an addition to the Faith: This was all the Chriſtian Fathers aimed at in their Diſputes againſt *Arius*, and other Enemies of the Catholick Faith, and in thoſe Creeds they framed in oppoſition to theſe Hereſies, to aſſert the true Divinity of

of the Son and Holy Spirit in ſuch expreſs terms, as would admit of no evaſion: For this reaſon they inſiſted ſo immovably upon the term *Homo-ouſios*, which ſignifies, that the Son was of the ſame Nature with the Father, as he muſt be, if he be true and real God; whereas had he been only like the Father, as the *Arians* aſſerted, he could not be One God with him; for that which is only *like* ſomething elſe, is not the ſame: Now though the term ὁμοούσιος, is not in Scripture, yet this is no unſcriptural addition to the Faith, becauſe all that is ſignified by it is there; that is, that Chriſt is the Eternal and Only Begotten Son of God, a true and real, not a made, or created, or nominal God: And the *Athanaſian* Creed, as far as it relates to this matter, is only a more particular explication of the *Homo-ouſios*, or in what ſenſe the Son is of the ſame Nature with the Father, and One God with him.

In the next place, the *Anhanaſian* Creed, having very explicitely declared the Unity of the Godhead in Three Perſons, proceeds to the diſtinct Characters of each Perſon, and their Unity among themſelves; and here alſo it teaches nothing but what ſeems eſſential to the Diſtinction and Unity of the Three Divine Perſons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt.

The Father is made of none, neither created nor begotten.

The Son is of the Father alone, not made, nor created, but begotten.

The Holy Ghoſt is of the Father, and of the Son, neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding.

So there is One Father, not Three Fathers; One Son, not Three Sons; One Holy Ghoſt, not Three Holy Ghoſts.

The Diſtinction then between theſe Three Divine Perſons, (if I may ſo ſpeak) is in the manner of their Subſiſtence: That the Father is Αὐτόθεος, God of Himſelf, the Original Fountain of the Deity, *not made, nor created*, for then he would be a Creature, not a God; *nor begotten*, for then he would be a Son, not the firſt Father and Origin of all.

The Son is of the Father alone, which is eſſential to his being a Son; *not made, nor created*, for there was no time, when he was not, as all things made or created muſt have a beginning, *but begotten*; which is the proper term, whereby we expreſs Generation, and whereby the Eternal Generation of the Son is expreſſed in Scripture: What it ſignifies we know not any further than this, That it is the Eternal communication of the Nature and Image of the Father to him; as an earthly Parent communicates his own Nature and Likeneſs to his Son.

The Holy Ghoſt is of the Father and of the Son, not *made, nor created*, for no Creature; *not begotten*, for no Son; *but proceeding*, ἐκπορευόμενον, the manner of which we underſtand no more, than the manner of the Eternal Generation; but there is this plain difference between being begotten and proceeding, that though the Holy Spirit have the ſame Nature with the Father and the Son, yet he repreſents the Perſon, of neither, as the Son does the Perſon of the Father, as *being the brightneſs of his Father's Glory, and the expreſs Image of his Perſon:* And therefore is ſaid not to be begotten, but to proceed.

But

But the difficulty of this is with reference to the Diſpute between the *Greek* and *Latin* Church about the *Filioque*, or the Spirit's proceeding from the Father and from the Son: The reaſon why the *Latin* Church inſiſts on this, is to preſerve the Unity and Subordination of the Divine Perſons to each other: The Son is united and ſubordinate to the Father, as begotten by him: The holy Ghoſt is united and ſubordinate to Father and Son, as proceeding both from the Father and from the Son; but if the Holy Spirit proceeded only from the Father, not from the Son, there would be no Union and Subordination between the Son and the Spirit; and yet the Spirit is the Spirit of the Son, as well as of the Father, and that theſe Three Perſons be One God, it is neceſſary, there ſhould be an Union of Perſons, as well as One Nature: But then the *Greek* Church confeſſes, That the Spirit proceedeth *from* the Father *by* the Son, though not *from* the Son; and *by* and *from* are ſuch Niceties, when we confeſs, we underſtand not the manner of this Proceſſion of the Holy Spirit, as ought to have made no Diſpute, much leſs a Schiſm between the two Churches: The *Greek* Church acknowledges, the Diſtinction of Perſons, and their Unity and Subordination; That *there is One Father, not Three Fathers; One Son, not Three Sons; One Holy Ghoſt, not Three Holy Ghoſts; that the Unity in Trinity, and the Trinity in Unity, is to be worſhipped:* Which is all this Creed requires as neceſſary to Salvation: *He therefore, that will be ſaved, muſt thus think of the Trinity*; that is, muſt acknowledge and worſhip a Trinity in Unity, and Unity in Trinity; which the *Greek* Church does, and therefore are not excluded from Salvation in this Creed upon the

nice Diſpute of the Spirit's proceeding *from* or *by* the Son.

That which ſeems to ſound harſheſt in this Creed is what follows:

And in this Trinity, none is afore or after other, none is greater or leſs than another.

But the whole Three Perſons are co-eternal, and co-equal.

And yet this we muſt acknowledge to be true, if we acknowledge all Three Perſons to be Eternal, for in Eternity there can be no *afore, or after other*; and that we cannot conceive an Eternal Generation or Proceſſion, is no great wonder, when we cannot conceive an Eternal Being, without any beginning or any cauſe: As for greater or leſs, and the equality of the Three Perſons, this we muſt confeſs alſo, if we believe all Three Perſons to be one Supreme and Sovereign God; for in one Supreme Deity, there cannot be greater or leſs: But then we muſt diſtinguiſh between Subordination and Equality: Perſons who are equal may be ſubordinate to each other; and though there be not a greater or leſs, yet there is Order in the Trinity: Equality is owing to Nature, Subordination to Relation and Order, which is indeed a greater and leſs in Relation and Order without an inequality of Nature, and it is the Equality of Perſons with reſpect to their Nature, not to their Order and Subordination, of which the Creed ſpeaks; for in this ſenſe the Father is greater than the Son, and the Father and the Son than the Holy Spirit, as being firſt in Order, but their Nature is the ſame, and their Perſons with reſpect to this ſame Nature co-equal.

And

And now I ſee no reaſon to make ſuch exclamations, as ſome Men do, againſt that damnatory Sentence, *That except every One do keep this Faith whole and undefiled, without doubt he ſhall periſh everlaſtingly*, and that *he that will be ſaved muſt thus think of the Trinity*; which referrs to no more than the belief of Three Perſons and One God, or a Trinity in Unity, and Unity in Trinity; which I take to be the true Chriſtian Faith, and as neceſſary to Salvation as any part of the Chriſtian Faith is: But of this more anon.

Thus much for the Doctrine of the Trinity; as for the Doctrine of the Incarnation, no Man can reaſonably except againſt that Explication, which is given of it in the *Athanaſian* Creed, without rejecting the Doctrine it ſelf, and then we may as well part with the Doctrine of the Incarnation, as with the *Athanaſian* Creed. As to ſhew this particularly:

For the right Faith is, that we believe and confeſs, that our Lord Jeſus Chriſt the Son of God, is God and Man: For otherwiſe the Son of God is not Incarnate, has not taken Humane Nature upon him.

God of the Subſtance of the Father begotten before the Worlds: As he muſt be, if he be God: *Man of the Subſtance of his Mother, born in the World*; for he could not be true Man, if he did not partake of Humane Fleſh and Blood.

Perfect God and perfect Man; for otherwiſe he were neither God, nor Man: *Of a reaſonable Soul, and humane-Fleſh ſubſiſting:* For a perfect Man conſiſts of Soul and Body, and unleſs he have both he is not a Man; in oppoſition to thoſe Hereticks, who thought that the Divine Nature animated a Humane Body,

inſtead of a Soul, but that Chriſt had no Humane reaſonable Soul, though he had a Humane Body, and therefore was no more a Man, than a Humane Body without a Soul is a Man, but a God cloathed with Fleſh and Blood.

Equal to the Father as touching his Godhead; for he is perfect God, of the ſame Subſtance with the Father; *and inferiour to his Father as touching his Manhood:* For a Man is inferiour to God, and therefore inferiour to the Father, though united in one Perſon to the Son.

Who although he be God and Man, yet he is not Two but One Chriſt.

One, not by the Converſion of the Godhead into Fleſh, but by taking the Manhood into God,

One altogether, not by Confuſion of Subſtance, but by Vnity of Perſon.

For as the reaſonable Soul and Fleſh is one Man; ſo God and Man is One Chriſt.

All this is neceſſary to the belief of the Incarnation, that the ſame Jeſus Chriſt is both God and Man; for if he be but One Chriſt, he muſt be God and Man in One Perſon; for two Perſons make two Chriſts; and if the ſame One Chriſt be both God and Man, then the Divine and Humane Nature continue diſtinct without any mixture or confuſion, he is perfect God and perfect Man, in oppoſition to the Hereſies of *Neſtorius* and *Eutyches*; the firſt of whom divided the Perſons, the ſecond confounded the Natures; the firſt made God and Man two diſtinct Perſons, and two Chriſts; the ſecond ſwallowed up the Humanity in God.

This

This may ſerve for a brief Vindication of the *Athanaſian* Creed, that it teaches nothing, but what is neceſſary to the true belief of a Trinity in Unity, and Unity in Trinity, and the Incarnation of the Son of God; and I thought fit to premiſe this, to let the World ſee, that all the ſpight againſt *Athanaſius*'s Creed, is not ſo much intended againſt the Creed, as againſt the Doctrine of the Trinity and Incarnation, which are ſo fenced and guarded from all Heretical Senſes and Expoſitions in that Creed, that there is no place left for tricks and evaſions: And now I come to conſider the Brief Notes, and to expoſe the Venome and Blaſphemy of them, which deſerves a ſharper Confutation than this: And that this Author may not complain of unfair uſage, I ſhall examine them Paragraph by Paragraph.

SECT. III.

Concerning the Neceſſity of the Fatholick Faith to Salvation, and a brief Hiſtory of Athanaſius.

The Creed.

Whoſoever will be ſaved, before all things, 'tis neceſſary, that he hold the Catholick Faith.

Brief Notes.

" A good Life is of abſolute neceſſity to Salvation; " but a right belief in theſe Points, that have been " always controverted in the Churches of God, is in " no degree neceſſary, much leſs *neceſſary before all* " *things*. He that leads a profane and vicious Life, " ſins againſt a plain acknowledged Rule, and the " plain and unqueſtioned Word and letter of the Di- " vine Law, and the dictates of natural Conſcience, " he *wilfully refuſes* to advert to theſe Monitors, and " therefore can no way palliate or excuſe his wicked- " neſs:

"neſs: But he that errs in a matter of Faith, after "having uſed *reaſonable diligence* to be rightly in- "formed, is in no fault at all: *His Error is pure Ig-* "*norance*; not a culpable Ignorance; For how can "it be culpable not to know that, of which a Man "is ignorant, after a diligent and impartial en- "quiry?

Anſwer. This, I muſt confeſs, is as artificial an Introduction to theſe Notes, as could have been invented; for it makes Faith a very uſeleſs, and Hereſie a very innocent and harmleſs thing; and then Men need not be much concerned what they believe, if they take care to live well: The Creed affirms, That *the Catholick Faith is before all things neceſſary to Salvation*; if this be true, then how vertuouſly ſoever Men live, they may be damned for Hereſie; and this is a dangerous Point, and will make Men too much afraid of Hereſie to trade in ſuch Notes as theſe; and therefore this muſt be confuted in the firſt place, to take off the dread and fear of Hereſie: Now can we hope, that any thing ſhould eſcape the Cenſures of ſuch a Critick, who will not allow the Catholick Faith to be neceſſary to Salvation? For if the Catholick Faith is not neceſſary, no Faith is, and then we may be ſaved without Faith; and yet the Scripture tells us, that we are juſtified and ſaved by Faith; and if any Faith ſaves us, I ſuppoſe, it muſt be the Catholick Faith, and then whoever does not hold this *ſaving Catholick Faith* muſt be damned. So that at beſt, he has placed this Note wrong; he ſhould only have oppoſed the neceſſity of *Athanaſius*'s *Catholick Faith* to Salvation, not of the Catholick Faith in general; and yet this ſeems not to be a miſtake, but deſign,

deſign, for his Arguments equally hold againſt all Faith, as well as againſt *Athanaſius*'s Creed, and will ſerve a *Turk*, a *Jew*, or a *Pagan*, as well as a Heretick. For if what he ſays is true: *He that errs in a Queſtion of Faith, after having uſed reaſonable diligence to be rightly informed, is in no fault at all:* How comes an Atheiſt, or an Infidel, a Turk, or a Jew to be in any fault; and if they be good Moral Men, and many of them are, or may be ſo, why ſhould they be damned for their Atheiſm or Infidelity, for their not believing a God, or not believing in Chriſt at all? For are not theſe Queſtions of Faith, whether there be a God and a Providence, and whether Chriſt be that *Meſſias*, who came from God? Or does our Author think, that no Atheiſt or Infidel, no unbelieving Jew, or Heathen, ever uſed *reaſonable diligence* to be rightly informed? Whatever he can ſay againſt their *reaſonable diligence*, I doubt, will be as eaſily ſaid againſt *the reaſonable diligence* of *Socinians*, and other Hereticks.

If you ſay, he confines this to ſuch *Points as have always been controverted in the Churches of God*, I deſire to know a reaſon, why he thus confines it? For does not his Reaſon equally extend to the Chriſtian Faith it ſelf, as to thoſe Points, which have been controverted in Chriſtian Churches? And why then ſhould not Infidels as well have the benefit of this Principle, as Hereticks? But I deſire to know, what Articles of our Faith have not been controverted by ſome Hereticks or other? And whether then this does not give ſufficient ſcope to Infidelity, to renounce all the Articles of our Creed, which have been denied or corrupted by ſome profeſſed Chriſtians?

But

But what he would insinuate in this, that these Points of the *Athanasian* Creed have always been matter of Controversie in the Christian Church, is manifestly false, as appears from all the Records of the Church: The Anti-*Nicene* Fathers were of the same Faith, before the Definition of the Council of *Nice*, as the learned Dr. *Bull* has abundanly proved; this was always the Faith of the Christian Church; and those Hereticks, who taught otherwise, either separated themselves from the Church, or were flung out of it; and I hope the Disputes of Hereticks against the Catholick Faith, shall not be called Controversies in the Churches of God.

And yet I desire to know, why that may not be the Catholick Faith, and necessary to Salvation, which has always been matter of Controversie? Has the Catholick Faith any such Priviledge as not to be controverted? Or is it a sufficient Proof that nothing is a Point of the Catholick Faith, which has been disputed and controverted by some or other in all Ages of the Church? And if Men of perverse Minds may dispute the most necessary Articles of Faith, then if any Faith be necessary, it may be of dangerous consequence, to err with our *reasonable diligence* in such necessary and fundamental Points, as are and have been disputed.

But before I dismiss this Point, it may be convenient to instruct this Author (if he can use any *reasonable diligence* to understand) how necessary it is to Salvation, and that *before all other things*, to hold the true Catholick Faith, and that the Faith of the *Athanasian* Creed is that Catholick Faith, which is necessary to Salvation.

1. As

1. As for the firſt of theſe, I would deſire him to conſider, that though without Holineſs no Man ſhall ſee God, yet no Man is ſaved by his good Works, but by Faith in Chriſt: to ſay, that we ſhall be ſaved by Holineſs and good Works without Faith in Chriſt, is to aſſert the Merit of good Works ten thouſand times more than ever Papiſts themſelves did: The meritorious Works of Popery ſerve only inſtead of Penance, to keep them out of Purgatory, or to ſhorten their time there; they ſerve inſtead of that Temporal Puniſhment, which abſolved and penitent Sinners muſt undergo for thoſe ſins, the Eternal Puniſhment of which is remitted, not for their own meritorious Works, but for the merits and expiation of Chriſt; but he who expects to be ſaved for his good Works without Faith in Chriſt, attributes ſuch a merit to good Works, as redeems him from the Wrath of God, and the Eternal Puniſhments due to Sin, and purchaſes Eternal Rewards for him, which is ſomewhat more than the Church of *Rome* pretends to; eſpecially ſince whatever merit they attribute to good Works, they aſcribe wholly to the Merits of Chriſt, whoſe Merits alone have made our good Works meritorious, which is very honourable to our Saviour, and very Orthodox Divinity, in compariſon with thoſe, who think good Works ſuch meritorious things, whatever their Faith be; and if he conſiders this twice, I ſuppoſe, he will confeſs, that Faith in Chriſt, the true Catholick Faith, is neceſſary to Salvation.

2. Nay, it is neceſſary *before all other things* to our Salvation, becauſe it is neceſſary to Baptiſm, which alone puts us into a ſtate of Salvation: For *he that believes and is baptized, ſhall be ſaved; but he*

that believes not ſhall be damned: All Chriſtians muſt confeſs, that there is no other Name given under Heaven whereby Men can be ſaved, but only the Name of Chriſt; that Faith in Chriſt in adult Perſons is neceſſary to Baptiſm, that Baptiſm alone incorporates us into the Body of Chriſt, and puts us into a ſtate of Salvation; and therefore that neither Jews, nor Turks, nor Heathens, none but believing and baptized Chriſtians are in a ſtate of Salvation, how morally Vertuous ſoever their Lives may be: Whoever does not confeſs this, makes nothing of the Covenant of Grace in Jeſus Chriſt, nothing of his Sacrifice, Prieſthood, and Interceſſion; makes the Chriſtian Religion nothing but a new and more perfect Sect of Philoſophy, than either Jews or Heathens taught before; whoſe Condition yet is as ſafe as the Condition of Chriſtians, if they live according to the knowledge they have: Our Author then muſt either renounce the Chriſtian Religion, or confeſs the true Catholick Faith, or a true Faith in Chriſt, is *before all other things* neceſſary to Salvation, becauſe this is that which puts us into a ſtate of Salvation by Chriſt, without which no Man can be ſaved according to the terms of the Goſpel.

3. If Faith in Chriſt be neceſſary to Salvation, I ſuppoſe, all Men will grant, it muſt be the true Faith in Chriſt, not a falſe and heretical Faith; for that is equivalent to Infidelity; there ſeems to be little difference between not believing in Chriſt at all, and not believing what we ought to believe of him, and the belief of which is neceſſary to Salvation; for if we do not believe that of Chriſt, which is neceſſary to Salvation, we may as well believe nothing: And then to be ſure it concerns us to hold the Catholick Faith, whatever that be.

4. That

4. That the Faith of the Holy Trinity is that true Chriſtian Faith, which is neceſſary to Salvation, appears from the Form of Baptiſm it ſelf; for we are baptized *in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt*; that is, into the Faith and Worſhip of the Trinity in Unity, and Unity in Trinity, which is the ſubſtance of the *Athanaſian* Creed: This is the Baptiſmal Faith, and that certainly is neceſſary to Salvation, if any Faith be: Now when we conſider, that Baptiſm is our ſolemn Dedication to God, and Admiſſion into Covenant with him, to be dedicated to the Son, and Holy Ghoſt, in the ſame manner, in the very ſame act, and ſame form of words, whereby we are dedicated to the Father, were they not One Supreme and Sovereign God with the Father, would make any conſidering Man abhor the Chriſtian Religion, as the moſt open and bare-faced Idolatry, as joyning Creatures with God in the moſt ſolemn Act of Religion, that of dedicating Men to his Worſhip and Service: But not to inſiſt on that now, our Author may hence learn, that to believe in Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, is neceſſary to Salvation, becauſe it is the Faith of Baptiſm; and if that Expoſition which the *Athenaſian* Creed has given of this Faith, be the true Catholick Doctrine, then that is neceſſary to Salvation; and therefore the Creed begins very properly with aſſerting the neceſſity of holding the Catholick Faith, if we will be ſaved; which muſt be as neceſſary to Salvation, as it is to be Chriſtians.

Which Faith except a Man keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he ſhall periſh everlaſtingly.

Notes. " By keeping this Faith *whole and undefiled* muſt " be meant, (if any thing be meant) that a Man " ſhould believe and profeſs it, without *adding to it*, " *or taking from it:* If we take from it, we do not " keep it whole, if we add ought to it, we do not " keep it undefiled, and either way we ſhall periſh " everlaſtingly.

Anſwer. A Man of ordinary Senſe and Candor would have ſaid, that to keep this Faith *whole and undefiled*, ſignified not to corrupt the Faith either by *adding to it*, *or taking from it:* For whatever we add, or whatever we take away, which does not alter the Eſſentials of our Faith, the Faith remains *whole and undefiled* ſtill: But this would have ſpoiled his notable Remarks both as to adding and taking away.

Notes. " Firſt for *adding:* What if an honeſt plain Man, " *becauſe he is a Chriſtian and a Proteſtant*, ſhould " think it neceſſary to add this Article to the *Atha-* " *naſian* Creed: *I believe the Holy Scriptures of the* " *Old and New Teſtament, to be a Divine, Infallible, and* " *compleat Rule, both for Faith and Manners?* I hope " no Proteſtant would think a Man damned for ſuch " addition: And if ſo, then this Creed of *Athanaſius* " is at leaſt *an unneceſſary Rule of Faith.*

Anſwer. That is to ſay, it is an addition to the Catholick Faith, to own the Scriptures to be the Rule of Faith: As if it were an addition to the Laws of *England* to own the Original Records of them in the *Tower:* For the Catholick Faith is what we are to believe, the Rule of Faith is that Book or Writing wherein this Catholick Faith is to be found, and upon the Autho-

rity

rity of which we muſt believe it; and therefore what the Catholick Faith is, and what is the Rule of Faith, are two very diſtinct Queſtions, and to apply what is ſaid of the Catholick Faith, to the Rule of Faith, becomes the Wit and Underſtanding of an Heretick: This is the very Argument, which the Papiſts uſe againſt our Authors Compleat and Infallible Rule of Faith, the Scriptures; that they do not contain all things neceſſary to Salvation, becauſe they do not prove the great Fundamental of the Proteſtant Faith, that the Canon of Scripture, which we receive is the Word of God; now what Anſwer he would give to Papiſts, with reference to the ſufficiency of Scripture, let him ſuppoſe, I give him the ſame Anſwer in Vindication of the Catholick Faith of the *Athanaſian* Creed, and we are right again.

But his parting blow is worth ſome little obſervation, That if the Scriptures be a compleat Rule of Faith, *then this Creed of* Athanaſius *is at leaſt an unneceſſary Rule of Faith:* But why did he not ſay the ſame thing of the Apoſtles Creed, or *Nicene* Creed, or any other Creeds, as well as of the *Athanaſian* Creed? for it ſeems a Creed, as a Creed (for there is no other ſenſe to be made of it) is a very *unneceſſary* thing, if the Scripture be a compleat Rule of Faith: And thus both Catholicks and Hereticks, even his dear *Arians* and *Socinians*, have troubled themſelves and the World to no purpoſe, in drawing up Creeds and Confeſſions of Faith.

But this Author ought to be ſent to School to learn the difference between a Creed, and a Rule of Faith: A Rule of Faith is a divinely inſpired Writing, which contains all matters to be believed, and upon the Authority of which we do believe; a Creed is a Summary

mary of Faith, or a Collection of ſuch Articles, as we ought to believe, the Truth of which we muſt examine by ſome other Rule: The ſumm then of our Author's Argument is this; That becauſe the Scripture is the Rule of Faith, and contains all things neceſſary to be believed, therefore it is very unneceſſary to collect out of the Scripture ſuch Propoſitions, as are neceſſary for all Chriſtians explicitely to believe: He might as well have proved from the Scriptures, being a compleat Rule of Faith, that therefore there is no neceſſity of Commentators, or Sermons, or Catechiſms, as that there is no neceſſity of Creeds.

But as ſenſeleſs as this is, there is a very deep fetch in it; for he would have no other Creed, but that *the Scripture is the Divine, Infallible, compleat Rule of Faith, which makes all other Creeds unneceſſary*; and then he can make what he pleaſes of Scripture, as all other Hereticks have done before him: But let me ask this Author, whether to believe in general, that the Scripture is the compleat Rule of Faith, without an explicite belief of what is contained in Scripture, will carry a Man to Heaven? There ſeems to me no great difference between this general Faith in the Scriptures, without particularly knowing and believing what they teach, and believing as the Church believes.

We ſuppoſe then, he will grant us the neceſſity of an explicite belief of all things contained in the Scripture neceſſary to Salvation; and ought not the Church then to inſtruct People, what theſe neceſſary Articles of Faith are, and what is the true ſenſe of Scripture about them? Eſpecially when there are a great many damnable Hereſies taught in the Church by

by Men of perverſe Minds, who wreſt the Scriptures to their own deſtruction; and does not this ſhew the neceſſity of Orthodox Creeds and Formularies of Faith?

And this puts me in mind of the great uſefulneſs of ancient Creeds, though the Holy Scripture be the only Divine and Infallible Rule of Faith, *viz.* That they are a kind of ſecondary Rule, as containing the Traditionary Faith of the Church: It is no hard matter for witty Men to put very perverſe ſenſes on Scripture to favour their heretical Doctrines, and to defend them with ſuch Sophiſtry as ſhall eaſily impoſe upon unlearned and unthinking Men; and the beſt way in this caſe is, to have recourſe to the ancient Faith of the Chriſtian Church, to learn from thence, how theſe Articles were underſtood and profeſſed by them: for we cannot but think, that thoſe who converſed with the Apoſtles, and did not only receive the Scriptures, but the ſenſe and interpretation of them from the Apoſtles, or Apoſtolical Men, underſtood the true Chriſtian Faith much better than thoſe at a farther remove; and therefore as long as we can reaſonably ſuppoſe this Tradition to be preſerved in the Church, their Authority is very Venerable; and this gives ſo great and venerable Authority to ſome of the firſt General Councils; and therefore we find *Tertullian* himſelf confuting the Hereticks of his Days, by this argument from Preſcription, or the conſtant Tradition of all Apoſtolical Churches, which was certain and unqueſtionable at that time; and as much as Papiſts pretend to Tradition, we appeal to Tradition for the firſt Three or Four Centuries; and if the Doctrine of the *Athanaſian* Creed have as good a Tradition as this, as certainly it has, it is no unneceſſary

ceſſary Rule, though we do not make it a primary and uncontroulable Rule, as the Holy Scripture is: Where there are two different Senſes put on Scripture, it is certainly the ſafeſt, to embrace that ſenſe (if the words will bear it) which is moſt agreeable to the received Doctrine of the Primitive Church, contained in the Writings of her Doctors, or Ancient Creeds, or ſuch Creeds, as are conformed to the Doctrine of the Primitive Church.

Notes. "Then *for taking ought from* this Creed, the whole "*Greek* Church (diffuſed through ſo many Provinces) "rejects *as Heretical* that Period of it, *The Holy* "*Ghoſt is of the Father and of the Son*; contending "that the Holy Spirit is *from the Father only*; which "alſo they clearly and demonſtratively prove, as we "ſhall ſee in its proper place. And for the menace "here of *Athanaſius*, that they ſhall periſh everla-"ſtingly; they laugh at it, and ſay, *He was drunk,* "*when he made that Creed. Gennad. Schol.* Arch-"Biſhop of *Conſtantin.*

Anſwer. This addition of the *Filioque*, or the Holy Ghoſt proceeding from the Father and from the Son, which was diſputed between the *Greek* and *Latin* Church, is no corruption of the Eſſentials of the Chriſtian Faith about the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity, as I obſerved before; nor does *Athanaſius* deny Salvation to thoſe, who do not believe it: *For he that will be ſaved, muſt thus think of the Trinity*, does not relate to every particular Word and Phraſe, but to that Doctrine, which immediately proceeds; *That the Trinity in Unity, and Unity in Trinity, is to be worſhipped*, which the *Greeks* acknowledged as

as well as the *Latins*, and therefore agreed in the Subſtantials of Faith, neceſſary to Salvation.

And that I have reaſon for what I ſay, appears from this; that after the *Latins* were perſwaded, that the Holy Ghoſt did proceed from the Son, they were far enough from denying Salvation to thoſe, who believed otherwiſe: Pope *Leo* III. aſſented to the definition of the Cauncil of *Aquiſgrane*, An. 809. concerning the Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt from the Son, and yet would by no means allow, that it ſhould be added to the Creed; nor would he deny Salvation to thoſe who believed otherwiſe, but when that Queſtion was asked him, returned this Anſwer; *That whoſoever has ſubtilty enough to attain to the Knowledge of this, or knowing it, will not believe it, cannot be ſaved; but there are many, and this among the reſt, deep Myſteries of the Holy Faith, which all cannot reach to, ſome by reaſon of Age, others for want of underſtanding, and therefore as we ſaid before, he that can, and won't, cannot be ſaved:* And therefore at the ſame time he commanded the *Conſtantinopolitan* Creed to be hung up at *Rome* in a Silver Table without the addition of the *Filioque*: nor can any Man tell when this was added to the Creed; however we never read the *Greeks* were Anathematized upon this account, till Pope *Urban* II. 1097. and in the Council of *Florence* under *Eugenius* IV. 1438--9. *Joſeph* the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople* thought this Controverſie between the two Churches might be reconciled, and the *Filioque* added in a ſence very conſiſtent with the belief of the *Greek* Church.

Voſſius de tribus Symbel. diſſert. 3 Cap. 29, 30.

Cap. 31. *Ibid.*

Cap. 48. *Ibid.*

As for what he adds, that the *Greek* Church condemned this addition as *Heritical*, I deſire to know,

Ibid. Cap. 44.

what *Greek* Council did this; *Voſſius* a very diligent Obſerver, gives no account of it; the quarrel of the *Greeks* with the *Latins* was, That they undertook without the Authority of a General Council, to add to the Creed of a general Council, when the Council of *Epheſus* and *Chalcedon* had Anathematized thoſe who did ſo; and therefore for this reaſon the *Greeks* Anathematized the *Latin* Church, without declaring the *Filioque* to be Heritical, and as that Learned Man obſerves, this was the true cauſe of the Schiſm, that the *Greeks* thought, the Pope of *Rome*, and a Weſtern Synod, took too much upon themſelves, to add to the Creed of a General Council, by their own Authority, without conſulting the *Eaſtern* Church, which was equally concerned in matters of Faith.

But the Comical part is ſtill behind; for he ſays, *The* Greeks *laugh at* Athanaſius's *menace, and ſay he was drunk when he made the Creed*; and for this he referrs us to *Georgius Scholarius*, or *Gennadius*, who was made Patriarch of *Conſtantinople* by Mahomet, when he had taken that City. I confeſs, I have not read all that *Gennadius* has Writ, and know not where to find this place, and he has not thought fit to direct us: But this I know, that whether *Gennadius* ſays this himſelf, or only reports it as the ſaying of ſome fooliſh *Greeks* (for I cannot gueſs by our Author, which it is) whoever ſaid it, ſaid more than is true, for *Athanaſius* neither made the Creed, drunk nor ſober, for as moſt Learned Men agree, he never made it at all, though it bears his name; but I wiſh I could ſee this place in *Gennadius*, for I greatly ſuſpect our Author; *Gennadius* being a very unlikely Man to ſay any ill thing of *Athanaſius*, upon account of the *Folioque*, who himſelf took

took the ſide of the *Latin* Church in this diſpute, and, as *Voſſius* relates, gives *Athanaſius* a very different, and more honourable Character ὁ τῆς ἀληθείας κήρυξ καὶ ὁμολογητὴς ὁ μέγας Ἀθανάσιος. The great *Athanaſius* the Preacher and Confeſſor of Truth. *Diſſert.* 2. c. 1.

But there is nothing ſmites me more than to hear this *Arian*, or *Socinian*, or whatever he is, affirm, *That the* Greeks *have clearly and demonſtratively proved, that the Holy Spirit is from the Father only*; For that which is proved *clearly* and *demonſtratively*, I hope is true, and then this alone is a confutation of his *brief Notes*, for the *Greeks* taught, and proved *demonſtratively*, as he ſays, that the Holy Spirit ſo proceeds from the Father only, as to be of the ſame Subſtance, and One God with the Father.

And the Catholick Faith is this. Creed.

"Catholick Faith is as much as to ſay in plain "*Engliſh*, the Faith of *the whole Church*; now in what "Age was this, which here follows, the Faith of the "whole Church. *Notes.*

The Catholick Faith, I grant, is ſo called with relation to the Catholick Church, whoſe Faith it is, and the Catholick Church is the Univerſal Church, or all the true Churches in the World, which are all but one whole Church, united in Chriſt their Head: the Profeſſion of the true Faith and Worſhip of Chriſt makes a true Church, and all true Churches are the One Catholick Church, whether they be ſpread over all the World, or ſhut up in any one corner of it, as at the firſt Preaching of the *Anſwer.*

Gospel the Catholick Church was no where but in *Judæa*. Now as no Church is the Catholick Church of Christ, how far soever it has spread it self over the World, unless it profess the true Faith of Christ, no more is any Faith the Catholick Faith, how universally soever it be professed, unless it be the true Faith of Christ; nor does the true Christian Faith cease to be Catholick, how few soever there be, who sincerely profess it. It is down right Popery to judge of the Catholick Church by its multitudes or large extent, or to judge of the Catholick Faith by the vast Numbers of its Professors: Were there but one true Church in the World, that were the Catholick Church, because it would be the whole Church of Christ on Earth, and were the true Christian Faith professed but in one such Church, it would be the Catholick Faith still, for it is the Faith of the whole true Church of Christ, the sincere belief and profession of which makes a Catholick Church.

Note. "Not in the Age of *Athanasius* himself, who for "this Faith, and for Seditious Practices was banish-"ed from *Alexandria* in *Ægypt* (where he was Bi-"shop) no less than four times; whereof the first "was by *Constantine* the Great.

Answer. *What shall be done unto thee, thou lying Tongue?* What Impudence is this, to think to sham the World at this time of day, with such stories as these? when the Case of *Athanasius* is so well known, or may be, even to *English* Readers, who will take the pains to read his Life, written with great exactness and fidelity by the learned Dr. *Cave*.

But

But when he thinks a ſecond time of it, will he ſay, that the Church of God in *Athanaſius*'s Age, was not of the ſame Faith with him? What thinks he of the *Nicene* Fathers, who condemned *Arius*? In which Council *Athanaſius* himſelf was preſent, and bore a conſiderable part, and ſo provoked the *Arian* Faction by his Zeal for the Catholick Faith, and his great skill and dexterity in managing that Cauſe, as laid the Foundation of all his future Troubles.

Will he ſay, that *Conſtantine* the Great, who called the Council at *Nice* in the Cauſe of *Arius*, and was ſo zealous an Aſſerter of the *Nicene* Faith, baniſhed *Athanaſius for this Faith*? No, his greateſt Enemies durſt not make his Faith any part of their Accuſation, though it was the only Reaſon of their Malice againſt him; but they charged him with a great many other Crimes; and that the Reader may the better underſtand by what Spirit theſe Men were acted, which ſtill appears in this Author, I ſhall give a ſhort Account of the Story.

The *Arian* Faction headed by *Euſebius* of *Nicomedia*, perceiving how impoſſible it was to retrieve their loſt Cauſe, while *Athanaſius* was in Credit, and ſo great Authority in the Church, having ripened their Deſigns againſt him in their private Cabals, prevail with *Conſtantine* to call a Council at *Cæſarea* in *Paleſtine*, at which *Athanaſius* did not appear, ſuſpecting, probably, the partiality of his Judges, who were his declared Enemies. This was repreſented at Court as a contempt of the Imperial Orders, and another Council was appointed at *Tyre*, which met *Ann.* 335. with a peremptory Command for his appearance; where he firſt excepted againſt the competency of his

his Judges, but that being over-ruled, he was forced to plead.

And first he was charged with Oppression and Cruelty, particularly towards *Ischyras*, *Callinicus*, and the *Miletian* Bishops: But this fell of it self, for want of proof. In the next place, he was accused for having ravished a Woman, and one too who had vowed Virginity: The Woman was brought into the Council, and there owned the Fact; but *Timotheus*, one of *Athanasius*'s Friends, personates *Athanasius*, and asks the Woman, whether he had ever offered such Violence to her; she supposing him to have been *Athanasius*, roundly declared him to be the Man, who had done the Fact; and thus this Cheat was discovered. His next Accusation was, That he had murdered *Arsenius*, a *Miletian* Bishop, whose Hand he had cut off, and kept by him for some Magical Uses; and the Hand dried and salted was taken out of a Box, and shewn to the Council: And to make this more credible, they had of a long time conveyed *Arsenius* away, and kept him out of sight: But he having made his escape about this time, and being accidentally met by some Friends of *Athanasius*, was on a sudden brought into the Council, where he shewed both his Hands safe, to the shame and confusion of the malicious Inventers of that Lye. This failing, they accuse him of Impiety, and Profanation of holy Things: That his Ordination was tumultuary and irregular; the contrary of which was evidently true: That *Macarius* his Presbyter, by his command, had broke into *Ischyras*'s Chancel, while he was performing the Holy Offices, and overturned the Communion Table, broke in pieces the Sacramental Chalice, and burnt the Holy Books; all which *Ischyras*

ras was preſent to atteſt; but the contrary in every branch of the Accuſation was made apparent, and the whole Plot diſcovered by a Writing under *Iſchyras* his own Hand, ſufficiently atteſted.

After all theſe ſhameful baffles they would not give over, but ſent Commiſſioners from the Synod to inquire into the matter of fact upon the place, and having raked together any thing, which they could make look like Evidence, though gained by the moſt barbarous Cruelties, and other vile arts, they return to the Council, who without more ado condemn and depoſe *Athanaſius* from his Biſhoprick, and command him to go no more to *Alexandria*; upon this he withdrew himſelf and went to Court, prays the Emperor for a more fair and impartial Tryal, who thereupon ſent to the Council, then adjourned to *Jeruſalem*, to come to *Conſtantinople*, and make good their charge: Five Commiſſioners appeared, who joyned with ſome others, whom they could get together, formed a ſmall Synod, but not daring to inſiſt upon their former accuſations, ſtart up a new Charge more like to take at Court, *viz.* That he had Threatned to ſtop the Emperors Fleet, that yearly Tranſported Corn from *Alexandria* to *Conſtantinople*; which was as true and as probable a Story as any of the reſt; but they told this with ſuch confidence, and urged the ill conſequences of it ſo home upon the Emperor, that they prevailed with him to baniſh *Athanaſius* to *Triers* in *Germany*. If this ſhort ſtory does not make our Author bluſh, he is poſſeſſed with the true Spirit of the *Tyrian* Fathers. But to proceed,

" He was alſo condemned in his own life time by " Six Councils, as an Heretick, and Seditious Perſon; " of *Notes.*

" of theſe Councils, that at *Milan* conſiſted of Three " Hundred Biſhops, and that of *Ariminum* of Five Hun- " dred and fifty, the greateſt Convention of Biſhops " that ever was. This conſent of the Churches of " God againſt him and his Doctrine, occaſioned that " famous Proverb, *Athanaſius againſt all the World,* " *and all the World againſt Athanaſius.*

Anſwer. This is all Sham. I grant, *Athanaſius* was condemned by ſeveral *Arian Conventicles* (which he prophanely calls the Churches of God) in his own life time, but I deny, that he was condemned *as a Heretick*, or that he was condemned for his Faith. We have ſeen the account of his condemnation by the Council of *Tyre* already, and for what pretended Crimes he was condemned, without the leaſt mention of his Hereſie ; for if this Author underſtood any thing of the ſtory of thoſe times, he muſt know, that though the *Arian* cauſe was vigorouſly and furiouſly promoted, yet it was done more covertly, ſince that fatal blow which was given it by the Council of *Nice*, whoſe Authority was too ſacred to be eaſily born down, and therefore they did not pretend to unſettle the *Nicene* Faith, nay pretended to own it, though they did not like the word *Homo-ouſios*, and therefore formed various Creeds, as they pretended to the ſame ſenſe without that litigious word: Which ſhews that it was not time of day for them to accuſe *Athanaſius* of Hereſie, but of ſuch other Crimes, as might condemn and depoſe him, and remove him out of the way, that he might not hinder their Deſigns.

Thus in the Council at *Antioch*, in the Reign of *Conſtantius*, 341. the old Calumnies are revived againſt

gainſt *Athanaſius*, and he depoſed again, after he had been reſtored by *Conſtantine* the younger, and *George* the *Cappadocian*, a Man of mean Birth, baſe Education, and worſe Temper (for they could find no better Man, that would accept it) was advanced to the Patriarchal Chair; but all this while he was charged with no Hereſie in Faith: But that his return to *Alexandria* had occaſioned great trouble and ſorrow there, and the effuſion of much Blood, that being condemned by a Synod, and not reſtored again by the Authority of a Synod, he re-aſſumed his Chair again, contrary to the Canons, *&c.*

Upon this *Athanaſius* fled to *Rome*, where in a Synod of *Weſtern* Biſhops, he was abſolved, and reſtored to Communion, contrary to the earneſt ſolicitations of the Council of *Antioch*. *Anno* 347, a Council of *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern* Biſhops was called at *Sardica*; where the *Eaſtern* Biſhops, (who were moſt of them *Arians*, or Favourers of that Party) refuſed to joyn with them of the *Weſt*, and acted in a ſeparate Aſſembly, and had brought with them Count *Muſonianus*, and *Heſychius* an Officer of the Imperial Palace, to countenance and promote their proceedings; and having beſpattered *Athanaſius* with all the ill things they had formerly charged him with, and tried in vain to delay the Sentence of the *Weſtern* Biſhops, they proceeded Synodically to condemn and depoſe him, together with ſeveral other principal Biſhops of the Catholick Party; of all which they publiſhed an *Encyclical* or Decretal Epiſtle, wherein they gave a large account of their whole proceeding. The *Weſtern* Biſhops in the mean time, after a large and particular Examination of *Athanaſius*'s Caſe, and all Matters of Fact relating to him, acquitted and reſto-

red him; and having heard the Complaints made to the Synod from all Parts concerning the Grievances they lay under from the *Arian* Faction; they particularly condemned and depoſed the chief Heads of that Party, and baniſhed them from the Communion of the Faithful, publiſhing an account of what they had done in ſeveral Synodical Letters: Thus far it was pretty well with *Athanaſius*, for all the Churches of God did not condemn him; if he were condemned by the *Eaſtern* Biſhops in a Schiſmatical Conventicle, he was abſolved by the *Weſtern* Council; if he was condemned by the *Arians*, he was abſolved by the Catholicks; but ſtill his Faith was no matter of the Diſpute.

But now the Zeal of *Conſtantius* reduced *Athanaſius* to greater extremity; for he lying at *Arles* in *France*, *Anno* 353, a Synod was held there, where all Arts were uſed to procure the condemnation of *Athanaſius*; at leaſt by refuſing to hold Communion with him; to which moſt of the Biſhops yielded, and *Vincentius* of *Capua* himſelf, the Pope's chief Legate, ſubſcribed the Condemnation; *Paulinus* of *Triers* for his honeſt Courage and Conſtancy in refuſing it, being driven into Baniſhment.

Not contented with this, as if poor *Athanaſius* could never be often enough condemned, *Anno* 355, *Conſtantius* going to *Milan*, another Synod was called there, and the Catholick Biſhops were ſtrictly required to ſubſcribe the Condemnation of *Athanaſius*; and the Emperor himſelf being preſent in the Synod, drew his Sword, and fiercely told them, That it muſt be ſo, that he himſelf accuſed *Athanaſius*, and that his Teſtimony ought to be believed: And for refuſing to comply, *Euſebius Vercellenſis*, *Lucifer Ca-*

Carolitanus, and ſeveral others were ſent into Baniſhment. This is the Council, which as our Author tells us, conſiſted of Three hundred Biſhops, but the Emperor was more than all the reſt, and it was he, that extorted the Condemnation of *Athanaſius*; and let him make his beſt of this.

The like Violence was uſed in other Synods, as in that of *Syrmium*, *Anno* 357, where a Confeſſion of Faith was drawn up, which *Hoſius* of *Corduba* was forced to ſubſcribe, and as ſome ſay, to condemn *Athanaſius*. *Anno* 359, was his other great Council at *Ariminum*, of Five hundred and fifty Biſhops, where they were ſo managed by the ſubtilty and importunity of ſome few *Arian* Biſhops, and ſo wearied out by *Taurus* the Prefect, and that by the Command of the Emperor, that they generally yielded, ſeveral of them being even ſtarved into compliance: And this is the time of which St. *Jerom* ſpeaks, that the whole World wondered to ſee it ſelf *Arian*: By ſuch Councils, and by ſuch Arts as theſe *Athanaſius* was condemned, though he was never accuſed nor condemned for his Faith, and that Veneration the whole Chriſtian World has had ever ſince for the Name of *Athanaſius*, is a ſufficient Vindication of his Perſon and Faith, notwithſtanding the ill uſage he met with under an *Arian* Emperor.

As for his next Paragraph, wherein he appeals to the late *Arian* Hiſtorian, *Chr. Sandius*, I ſhall only refer the Reader to Dr. *Bull*'s Anſwer, and I think I am more than even with him; and whoever will read and conſider what that learned Man has irrefragably proved, that thoſe Fathers, who lived before the Council of *Nice*, were yet of the ſame Faith with the *Nicene* Fathers as to the Doctrine of the Holy

Trinity, will ſee, that a very modeſt Man may call this *the Catholick Faith*, even in his ſenſe of the word *Catholick*, as it ſignifies the common Faith of Chriſtians in all Ages, ſince the Preaching of the Goſpel in the World: And that it requires both *Forehead* and Forgery to deny it. And if in that Age *Athanaſius* were the only Man who durſt openly and boldly defend the Catholick Faith, againſt a prevailing Faction, ſupported by a Court Intereſt, and grown formidable by Lyes and Calumnies, and the moſt barbarous Cruelties, it is for his immortal Honour, and will always be thought ſo by the Churches of Chriſt.

And now I come to anſwer his terrible Objections againſt the ſeveral Articles of this Creed, which he has endeavoured to ridicule; and when I have done ſo, I hope he will think it time to conſider, what it is to ridicule the Chriſtian Faith: A modeſt Man would not affront the general Faith of Chriſtians, at leaſt of that Church in which he lives; and a cautious Man, whatever his private Opinion were, would not ridicule ſo venerable a Myſtery, leſt it ſhould prove true; which is the ſame Argument we uſe to make Atheiſts modeſt, not to laugh at the Notion of a God, leſt he ſhould find the God, whom he has ſo impudently affronted, when he comes into the other World.

SECT.

SECT. IV.

The Catholick Doctrine of a Trinity in Unity, and Unity in Trinity explained, and vindicated from all pretended Abſurdities and Contradictions.

Creed. THE *Catholick Faith is this, that we worſhip One God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity.*

Notes. "He means here, that we muſt ſo worſhip the "One true God, as to remember he is Three Per- "ſons; and ſo worſhip the Three Perſons, as to bear "in mind, they are but One Subſtance, or Godhead, "or God: So the Author explains himſelf in the "Three next Articles, which are theſe:

Neither confounding the Perſons, nor dividing the Subſtance: For there is One Perſon of the Father, another of the Son, another of the Holy Ghoſt: But the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt, is all One. "Therefore all theſe Articles "make indeed but One Article, which is this: The "One true God is *Three diſtinct Perſons*, and Three "diſtinct Perſons (Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt) are "the One true God.

Anſwer. Thus far I agree with this Author; and indeed this is the whole of the Creed, as far as relates to the Doctrine of the Trinity, that there are *Three Perſons and One God*, all the reſt being only a more particular explication of this; and therefore I would deſire the Reader to obſerve, for the underſtanding this Creed, what belongs to the Perſons, and what to the One Eternal undivided Subſtance or Godhead, which will anſwer all the

the ſeeming Contradictions which are charged on this Doctrine. But he proceeds :

Notes. " Plainly as if a Man ſhould ſay, *Peter*, *James*, " and *John*, being Three Perſons, are One Man ; " and One Man is theſe Three Perſons, *Peter*, *James*, " and *John*. Is it not now a ridiculous Attempt, as " well as a barbarous Indignity, to go about thus to " make Aſſes of all Mankind, under a pretence of " teaching them a Creed, and Things Divine, to de- " ſpoil them of their Reaſon, the Image of God, and " the Character of our Nature ? But let us in two " words, examine the Parts of this monſtrous Propo- " ſition, as 'tis laid down in the Creed it ſelf.

Neither confounding the Perſons, nor dividing the Subſtance.

" But how can we not but confound the Perſons, " that have (ſay they) but *One numerical Subſtance* ; " and how can we but divide the Subſtance, which " we find in Three *diſtinct divided Perſons*.

Anſwer. Our Author ſhould have kept to *Athanaſius*'s Creed, which he undertook to expoſe, and then we had not heard of this Objection : For the Creed does not ſay, that there are Three Perſons in *One numerical Subſtance*, but in *One undivided* Subſtance ; nor does it ſay, that there are Three divided Perſons in this One undivided Subſtance ; but *Three Perſons*, which may be *Three*, and yet not divided, but intimately united to each other in One undivided Subſtance : Now tho' we ſhould grant it unconceivable, how Three diſtinct Perſons ſhould have One numerical

cal Eſſence, that the Eſſence of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt ſhould be numerically the ſame, and yet their Perſons diſtinct; for it is not eaſie to diſtinguiſh the Eſſence or Subſtance from the Perſon, and therefore not eaſie to tell, how there ſhould be but One Subſtance and Three Perſons, yet it is no Abſurdity or Contradiction to ſay, that Three real ſubſtantial Perſons ſhould ſubſiſt in One undivided Subſtance, and then there is no neceſſity either *to confound the Perſons*, or *divide the Subſtance*. We muſt allow the Divine Perſons to be real ſubſtantial Beings, if we allow each Perſon to be God, unleſs we will call any thing a God, which has no real Being, as that has not, which has not a real Nature and Eſſence, whereas all Men grant there are no Accidents, or Qualities, or Modes in God, but a pure and ſimple Eſſence, or pure Act; and therefore the Three Divine Perſons are ſubſtantially diſtinct, though in One undivided Subſtance: Which ſhews, that to ſay, *That the One true God is Three diſtinct Perſons, and Three diſtinct Perſons are the One true God, is not plainly, as if a Man ſhould ſay, That* Peter, James *and* John, *being Three Perſons are One Man, and One Man is Three diſtinct Perſons*, Peter, James, *and* John: Becauſe *Peter*, *James*, and *John*, are not only diſtinct, but divided and ſeparate Perſons, which have Three divided and ſeparate Subſtances, which therefore cannot be One Man, as Three diſtinct Perſons in One undivided Subſtance are One God.

This is ſufficient to vindicate the *Athanaſian* Creed, which only aſſerts Three diſtinct Perſons in One undivided Subſtance, which has nothing abſurd or contradictious in it; but becauſe this Author founds his Objection upon *One numerical Subſtance*, let us briefly conſider

conſider that too; for the Divine Eſſence or Subſtance is certainly *numerically One*, as there is but One God, and the difficulty is, how Three diſtinct ſubſtantial Perſons can ſubſiſt in One numerical Eſſence: I will not pretend to fathom ſuch a Myſtery as this, but only ſhew, that there is nothing abſurd in it, and take down the confidence of this vain Pretender to Reaſon and Demonſtration.

Let us then enquire, what it is, that makes any Subſtance numerically One, that if there be any Abſurdity in this, we may find out where it lies.

Now in unorganized Matter it is nothing elſe but the union of Parts, which hang all together, that makes ſuch a Body One; whether it be ſimple or compounded of different kinds of Matter, that is One numerical Body, whoſe Parts hang all together. In Organical Bodies, the Union of all Parts, which conſtitute ſuch an organized Body, makes it One entire numerical Body, though the Parts have very different Natures and Offices; but this is of no uſe to explain the numerical Oneneſs of the Divine Eſſence, becauſe the Divine Subſtance has no Extenſion, and no Parts, and therefore cannot be One by an Union of Parts.

In finite created Spirits, which have no Parts and no Extenſion neither, that we know of, no more than a Thought, or an Idea, or a Paſſion, have Extenſion or Parts, their numerical Oneneſs can be nothing elſe, but every Spirit's Unity with it ſelf, and diſtinct and ſeparate ſubſiſtence from all other created Spirits. Now this Self-unity of the Spirit, which has no Parts to be united, can be nothing elſe but Self-conſciouſneſs: That it is conſcious to its own Thoughts,

Thoughts, Reaſonings, Paſſions, which no other finite Spirit is conſcious to but it ſelf: This makes a finite Spirit numerically One, and ſeparates it from all other Spirits, that every Spirit feels only its own Thoughts and Paſſions, but is not conſcious to the Thoughts and Paſſions of any other Spirit: And therefore if there were Three created Spirits ſo united as to be conſcious to each others Thoughts and Paſſions, as they are to their own, I cannot ſee any reaſon, why we might not ſay, that Three ſuch Perſons were numerically One, for they are as much One with each other, as every Spirit is One with it ſelf; unleſs we can find ſome other Unity for a Spirit than Self conſciouſneſs; and, I think, this does help us to underſtand in ſome meaſure this great and venerable Myſtery of *a Trinity in Unity*.

For God being preſent every-where without Parts, and without Extenſion, we muſt ſtrip our Minds of all material Images and Figures, when we contemplate the Unity of the Divine Nature. Though we ſhould ſuppoſe but One Perſon in the God-head, as well as One God, (as this Author does) yet we muſt conſider his Unity, not as the Unity of an infinite Body, but an infinite Mind, which has no diſtinct Parts to be united; and let any Man, who can give me any other Notion of the numerical Oneneſs of an infinite Mind, but Self-conſciouſneſs, that though preſent every-where, it is ſtill intimate with it ſelf: and in the very ſame way, and for the very ſame reaſon, Three Divine Perſons, who are as intimate to each other, and if I may ſo ſpeak, as mutually conſcious to each other, as any One Perſon can be to it ſelf, are truly and properly numerically One.

This, I ſuppoſe, is what ſeveral Ancient Fathers call'ed περιχωρησις, or Circuminceſſion, which I confeſs is an ill word, and apt to raiſe very material Imaginations in us, as if the Divine Perſons were united in One Subſtance, as three Bodies would be, could they touch in every Point; whereas we know not, what the Subſtance of an infinite Mind is, nor how ſuch Subſtances as have no Parts or Extenſion can touch each other, or be thus externally united; but we know the Unity of a Mind or Spirit, reaches as far as its Self-conſciouſneſs does, for that is One Spirit, which knows and feels it ſelf, and its own thoughts and motions, and if we mean this by Circuminceſſion, Three Perſons thus intimate to each other are numerically One: And therefore St. *Auſtin* repreſents this much better by that Self-conſciouſneſs which is between thoſe diſtinct Faculties in us, of Memory, Underſtanding, and Will, which know and feel whatever is in each other: We remember what we underſtand and will, we underſtand, what we remember and will, and what we will, we remember and underſtand; and therefore theſe Three Faculties, which are thus intimate to each other, make one Man, and if we can ſuppoſe Three Infinite Minds and Perſons, thus conſcious of whatever is in each other, as they are of themſelves, they can be but One numerical God.

Aug. l'b. contra Serm. Arrian, c. 16.

But that this may not be thought a meer arbitrary and groundleſs conjecture, I ſhall ſhew you, that this is the true Scripture Notion of the Unity of the Godhead, or of Three Perſons and One God.

That the Three Divine Perſons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, are Three Infinite Minds, really diſtinct from each other, that the Father is not the Son, nor

nor the Holy Ghoſt either the Father, or the Son, is ſo very plain in *Scripture*, that I ſhall not ſpend time to prove it, eſpecially ſince it is ſuppoſed in this Controverſie; for when we enquire, how theſe Three Infinite Minds or Perſons are One God, it ſuppoſes, that they are diſtinct; and if there were any Diſpute about it, what I ſhall ſay in explaining their Unity, will prove their Diſtinction, that they are Three diſtinct infinite minds.

1. Let us then conſider, what the Unity is between the Father and the Son: for ſo our Saviour tells us, *I and the Father are One*, 10 John 30. And how they are One, we learn from ſeveral places in this Goſpel, which as the Ancients tell us, was wrote on purpoſe in oppoſition to the Hereſie of *Cerinthus*, to prove, that Chriſt was not meer Man, but the Eternal Son of God, and One with his Father: Now 1 *John* 1. the Evangeliſt calls him the λόγος, or the Word of God, the Eternal Wiſdom and Reaſon of God, and therefore as intimate to God as his own Eternal Word and Wiſdom; as intimate as a Man's own Wiſdom and Reaſon is to him; and therefore he adds, that this Word which was in the beginning, was πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν *with God*, as we tranſlate it, which cannot ſignifie a local preſence, but an eſſential union, or a being in God, as Chriſt tells us, *The Father, is in me, and I in him*, 10 *John* 38. for before place was made, or any thing to fill it, to be *with God* could ſignifie nothing elſe but to ſubſiſt in him, and therefore, *v.* 18. the Apoſtle expounds this being *with God*, by being *in the boſome of the Father*; which cannot ſignifie an External Union, becauſe God has no External Boſom; but Boſom ſignifies the very Eſſence of God, and if we could diſtinguiſh

Parts in God, the moſt inward and ſecret Receſſes of the Divine Nature: Now this intimate Union and *In-being*, when we ſpeak of an eſſential Union of pure and infinite Minds is a mutual conſciouſneſs, and if I may ſo ſpeak, an inward ſenſation of each other, to know and feel each other, as they know and feel themſelves.

To repreſent this plainly and intelligibly, if it be poſſible, to the meaneſt underſtanding, I ſhall conſider, wherein the moſt perfect Union of created Spirits conſiſt, which are diſtinct and ſeparate Beings from each other, wherein the Union of the Divine Perſons in the Ever Bleſſed Trinity anſwer this, and wherein it excels it.

Now created Spirits, as Angels and Humane Souls, are then moſt perfectly united to each other, when they moſt perfectly know one another, and know all, that each other knows, and perfectly agree in all they know, which is an Union in Knowledge: when they perfectly love one another, have the ſame will, the ſame affections, the ſame intereſts and deſigns; when they are a kind of Uniſons, which move and act alike, as if one Soul animated them both: This is that perfect Unity, which is ſo frequently and earneſtly recommended to Chriſtians both by Chriſt and his Apoſtles; as we may ſee every-where in Scripture.

And the very ſame Union with this, there is between the Perſons of the Ever Bleſſed Trinity; an Union in knowledge, in love, in will, in works.

The Son perfectly knows the Father, and therefore knows all that the Father knows; this St. *John* means when he tells us, that he is in the Boſom of the Father; 1 *John* 18. *No man hath ſeen God at any time:* that is, no Man ever had a perfect knowledge of God, which

which is here called *ſeeing*, becauſe ſight gives us the moſt diſtinct and perfect knowledge of things: *The only begotten Son, which is in the boſom of the Father, he hath declared him:* Where it is plain, to be *in the boſom of the Father*, is put to ſignifie the moſt perfect and intimate knowledge of him; as in ordinary ſpeech to take any Man into our boſom, ſignifies to impart all our Secrets to him: but our Saviour tells us this in plain words, that the Father perfectly knows the Son, and the Son the Father, 10 *John* 15. *As the Father knoweth me, ſo know I the Father.* Thus *the Father loveth the Son*, 3 Joh. 25. 5 Joh. 20. And the Son loveth the Father, 14 *John* 31. Thus the Son has no will but his Fathers, 5 *John* 20. *I can of my own ſelf do nothing, as I hear, I judge, and my judgment is juſt; becauſe I ſeek not mine own will, but the will of the Father, which hath ſent me.* 6 John 38. *For I came not to do my own will, but the will of him that ſent me.* 4 John 34. *My meat is to do the will of him that ſent me, and to finiſh his work:* Thus whatever Chriſt did or ſpake, it was in conformity to his Father, what he ſaw, and heard, and learnt of him. 5 John 19. *The Son can do nothing of himſelf, but what he ſeeth the Father do; for whatſoever things he doth, theſe alſo doth the Son likewiſe.* 12 John 49. *I have not ſpoken of my ſelf, but the Father that ſent me, he gave me a commandment, what I ſhould ſay, and what I ſhould ſpeak.* This is as perfect an Union, as Union ſignifies agreement and concord, as can poſſibly be between two minds and ſpirits.

The like may be ſaid of the Holy Ghoſt: He perfectly knows the Father, and his moſt ſecret Counſels: *For the ſpirit ſearcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God*, 1 Cor. 2. 10. He is the Spirit of Wiſdom and Re-

Revelation, who inſpired the Prophets and Apoſtles, to declare God and his will to the World, and therefore is moſt intimately acquainted with it himſelf: Thus our Saviour comforts his Apoſtles, when he was to leave them himſelf, with the Promiſe of the Spirit, who ſhall guide them into all truth. 16 *Joh.* 13, 14, 15. *Howbeit when he the ſpirit of truth is come, he ſhall guide you into all truth; for he ſhall not ſpeak of himſelf, but whatſoever he ſhall hear, that ſhall he ſpeak, and he will ſhew you things to come. He ſhall glorifie me, for he ſhall receive of mine, and ſhall ſhew it unto you: All things that the Father hath are mine, therefore ſaid I, that he ſhall take of mine, and ſhall ſhew it unto you.* Of which words more hereafter; at preſent I only obſerve, how intimately the Holy Spirit is acquainted with all the Secrets both of Father and Son, whatever things the Father knows, that the Son knows, and what the Son knows, that the Holy Spirit knows; that is, whatever the Father knows, which is firſt ſaid to be the Father's, then the Son's, and then the Holy Spirit's, according to the Order of Perſons in the adorable Trinity.

Thus the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Love, which inſpires us with the love of God, and gives us the reciprocal Teſtimonies of God's love to us: *For the love of God is ſhed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghoſt, which is given unto us,* 5 Rom. 5. And as ſome of the Ancients repreſent it, he is that love, wherewith the Father and the Son love each other; and therefore there is no queſtion, but that he who unites Father and Son, and unites God to us, and us to God, by love, is united to Father and Son by love himſelf.

He

He is that Holy Spirit, who renews and ſanctifies us, and ſubdues our wills into a conformity and ſubjection to the will of God, and therefore no doubt, but he has the ſame will with Father and Son.

Thus Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, are moſt intimately united in knowledge, will, and affection, but after all, this is no more, than what we call a Moral Union; ſuch as may be between created Spirits, which remain ſeparate Beings ſtill, and though they are morally, are not eſſentially One; and therefore ſuch an Union as this cannot make Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt One God, but Three agreeing and conſenting Gods, as *Peter*, *James*, and *John*, though they ſhould in the moſt perfect manner be united, in the ſame Faith, and mutual love and affection, *&c.* yet would be Three Men ſtill: And therefore I muſt now ſhew, that what is meerly a Moral Union between Creatures, is an eſſential Union between the Perſons of the Ever Bleſſed Trinity.

And this I have already ſhewn in part. The Three Divine Perſons of the Ever Bleſſed Trinity, are united in knowledge, in will, in love, but are not united as Creatures are by an external likeneſs, conformity, agreement, conſent, in knowledge, will, and affection, but are ſo united to each other, as every Man is to himſelf, not as one Man is to another.

As for inſtance: Every Man by an inward ſenſation feells his own knowledge, will, and affections, but he does not know any other Man's thoughts, or will, or paſſions, by feeling them in himſelf, as he does his own, but by an external communication of thoughts; and therefore though they may be morally One by an exact

exact agreement and harmony of thoughts and paſſions, as far as by external communication they can know what each others thoughts and paſſions are, yet they are eſſentially diſtinct and ſeparate: But Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, are One not by an external agreement or conſent, but by an internal conſciouſneſs, as every Man is One with himſelf: If I may ſo ſpeak, becauſe we want proper words to expreſs it, they feel each other in themſelves, know the ſame thing by feeling each others knowledge, and will, and love a-like, by feeling what each other wills and loves, juſt as every Man feels his own thoughts, knowledge, will, and paſſions; that is, are as intimate to each other, and as eſſentially One, by a mutual Self-conſciouſneſs, as every Man is One with himſelf.

And the phraſes and expreſſions of Scripture, whereby the Unity or Onenſs of Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt are expreſſed, require this ſenſe. Thus I obſerved before, that the Son is the eternal word and wiſdom of the Father, and therefore as intimate to him, as every Man's Reaſon is to himſelf, and knows the Father, not by external Revelation, but as every Man knows himſelf.

But the moſt frequent expreſſion, whereby Chriſt repreſents this cloſe and intimate and eſſential Union between his Father and him, is, *I am in the Father, and the Father in me*; which he repeats ſeveral times in St. *John's* Goſpel. Now if we will allow this to be a proper, not a metaphorical expreſſion, it can ſignifie no other Union, than what I have now deſcribed: That it is a proper, and not a metaphorical expreſſion, appears from this, that there is no ſuch Union in Nature between any two other Beings, as this

this, to be in *One another*, and a Metaphor is tranſlated from ſomething, that is real and natural, upon account of ſome likeneſs and ſimilitude, and therefore that which is like to nothing elſe, which has no Pattern and Example, can be no Metaphor, becauſe it alludes to nothing: Now if we ſpeak of a ſubſtantial Union, or a Union of Subſtances, what two Subſtances can there be in the World, which can mutually be in each other, or can mutually comprehend each other, which is indeed a palpable contradiction, as ſignifying at the ſame time to be greater and to be leſs than each other; for in ſubſtantial Unions, that which comprehends is greater than that which is comprehended, that which is within any thing elſe is leſs than that which contains it; and therefore for two Beings mutually to comprehend, and to be comprehended by each other, is to be greater and leſs than each other, greater as they comprehend each other, and leſs as they are comprehended.

So that this Oneneſs between the Father and the Son, is ſuch an Union as there is nothing in Nature like it, and we cannot long doubt, what kind of Union this is, if we conſider, that there is but one poſſible way to be thus united, and that is by this mutual Conſciouſneſs, which I have now deſcribed. If the Son be conſcious in himſelf of all that the Father is, as conſcious to the knowledge, to the will, to the love of the Father, as he is to his own, by an internal ſenſation, then the whole Father is in the Son; if the Father be thus conſcious to all that the Son is, then the whole Son is in the Father; if the Holy Ghoſt be thus conſcious to all that is in the Father and in the Son, then the Father and the Son are in the Holy Ghoſt, and the Holy Ghoſt in the Father and the

Son, by this mutual Conſciouſneſs to each other. This is very plain and intelligible, and makes them as much One, as every Man is One with himſelf, by Self-conſciouſneſs.

And this is a plain demonſtration, that all Three Divine Perſons are coeſſential and coequal with each other: We know nothing of God, but that he is an infinite Mind; that is, infinite Knowledge, Wiſdom, Power, Goodneſs: And if theſe Three Divine Perſons are all internally conſcious of all theſe Perfections, which are in each other, they muſt all have the ſame Perfections, the ſame Knowledge, Wiſdom, Power, Goodneſs, that is the ſame Nature, unleſs that Knowledge, Wiſdom, Goodneſs, which we are internally conſcious of, and feel within our ſelves, be not the Perfections of our Nature; whereas we may externally know thoſe Perfections, which are not ours, but what we feel in our ſelves is our own: and therefore this mutual Conſciouſneſs, makes all that is the Father's, the Son's, and all that is the Son's, the Holy Spirit's; as our Saviour ſpeaks: *All things that the Father hath are mine: therefore ſaid I, that he* (the Spirit) *ſhall take of mine, and ſhall ſhew it unto you*, 16 *John* 15. And if theſe Three Perſons be thus mutually in each other, as you have already heard, they muſt be all equal: for if the Father be in the Son, how can the Son be leſs than the Father, if he comprehends the Father, and all his infinite Perfections? If Son and Holy Ghoſt are in the Father, and Father and Holy Ghoſt in the Son, and Father and Son in the Holy Ghoſt, imagine what inequality you can between them; if Son and Holy Ghoſt are conſcious to all the infinite Perfections, which are in the Father, and have all the Perfections, they are conſcious

ous to, how can Son and Holy Ghoſt be leſs perfect than the Father, or than each other: I am ſure our Saviour attributes all his Wiſdom, and Knowledge, and Power to his intimate conſcious Knowledge of his Father, which he calls *ſeeing him*, which is ſuch a knowledge as Creatures cannot have of God, *John* 5. 19, 20. *Verily, verily, I ſay unto you, the Son can do nothing of himſelf, but what he ſeeth the Father do; for whatſoever things he doth, thoſe alſo doth the Son likewiſe. For the Father loveth the Son, and ſheweth him all things, that himſelf doeth, and he will ſhew him greater works than theſe, that ye may marvel.* By this perfect conſcious knowledge, which the Son has of the Father, he has all thoſe Perfections in himſelf, which are in the Father, he can do whatever he ſees the Father do, and he ſees whatever the Father does, but can do nothing of himſelf, but what he ſeeth the Father do; He has all the Perfections which are in the Father, and therefore can do whatever he ſees the Father do; but there is no Knowledge, no Perfection, no Power in the Son, which is not in the Father, and which he does not receive from the Father, and therefore he can do nothing of himſelf, but what he ſees the Father do; which ſignifies the moſt perfect equality between the Father and the Son, founded on the Son's ſeeing the Father, and whatever he doth, or his intimate Conſciouſneſs of all that the Father is. And this is the true Notion of the Son's being the Image of his Father: *The brightneſs of his Father's glory, and the expreſs image of his perſon*, 1 Heb. 2. For as a dead Image and Picture repreſents the external Lineaments and Features of the Perſon, whoſe Picture or Image it is, that we can ſee the Perſon in his Picture; ſo a living eſſential Image, is the living eſſential Perfecti-

ons of the Father, and with a conſcious knowledge ſees the Father in himſelf.

For this reaſon the Son is ſaid *to hear of his Father, to ſee what his Father doth, and to do the ſame, to receive commandment from his Father, to do the will of his Father, and the works of his Father, to finiſh the works, which his Father gave him to do, to glorifie his Father*, &c. Which muſt not be expounded after the manner of Men, (as the *Socinians* expound ſuch expreſſions, and thence conclude the great inferiority, inequality, ſubjection of the Son to the Father, ſuch as there is between a Prince, and the Miniſters he employs, and that therefore the Son cannot be the Supreme God, for the Supreme God cann't be commanded, taught, ſent on Meſſages to fulfil the Will and Pleaſure of another, and do nothing but what he ſees done, and receives Commiſſion to do; I ſay, we muſt not put ſuch a mean and ſervile ſenſe on theſe expreſſions) but we muſt expound them only to ſignifie that the Son receives all from the Father, Life, Knowledge, Will, Power, by Eternal Generation, and whatever he does, he does with a Conſciouſneſs of his Father's Will, and Wiſdom, as it were, feeling the Will, and Wiſdom, and Power of his Father in himſelf; and this he calls hearing and ſeeing the Works of the Father, receiving Commands, and doing the Works of the Father, becauſe his Nature is that to him, which external Teachings, and verbal Commands are to Men: He hears, he ſees, he does the Works, and Will and Commands of his Father, by being the perfect, living, ſelf-conſcious Image of his Father's Will and Knowledge and infinite Perfections.

But

But there is one place more I muſt take notice of, by which the *Socinians* think to overthrow all that I have now ſaid; that the Union between the Father and Son is not ſuch an eſſential Unity, as we ſpeak of, but a meer moral Union, or a perfect agreement and conſent in Knowledge, Will, and Affection, ſuch as is, or ought to be among Chriſtians; and that our Saviour himſelf has thus expounded it, 17 *John* 20, 21. *Neither pray I for theſe alone, but for them alſo which ſhall believe on me through their word: That they all may be One, as thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that they alſo may be One in us:* Which is the very expreſſion I have ſo much inſiſted on, to prove this eſſential Union, and Self-conſciouſneſs between the Father and the Son, *As thou Father art in me, and I in thee:* Which, it ſeems, ſignifies no other kind of Union, than what our Saviour prays for among Chriſtians, *That they alſo may be One, as thou Father art in me, and I in thee:* Now the Union of Chriſtians is only an Union in Faith and Love, and One Communion, and therefore thus the Father and the Son are One alſo by a conſent and agreement in Knowledge, Will, and Love.

Now this I readily grant, as I obſerved before, that Father and Son are One by a moſt perfect agreement in Knowledge, Will, and Love, which we call a Moral Union between Men; and it is this Unity or Oneneſs for which our Saviour prays, that his Diſciples may be One, as the Father and He are One; that they may perfectly agree in the ſame Faith and Love, that they may ſpeak the ſame things, and mind the ſame things: But then this perfect Harmony and Conſent between the Father and the Son reſults from an eſſential Unity, from their being in one another, which is ſuch

ſuch an Union as it is impoſſible there ſhould be between Chriſtians; but this Moral Union in the ſame Faith, and mutual Love, is called being One, as the Father and Son are One, becauſe it is the neareſt reſemblance of this eſſential Unity, that can be between Creatures; and that is the only meaning of *As*, *That they may be One*, *As thou Father art in me*, *and I in Thee*: Not that they may be One in the very ſame manner, but with ſuch a kind of Unity, as does moſt nearly reſemble the Unity between the Father and the Son; that is, which produces the like Conſent and Harmony in Will and Affections.

For we muſt obſerve, that *As* very often ſignifies only ſome likeneſs and reſemblance, not a ſameneſs for kind or degree; and thus it muſt of neceſſity ſignifie in all Compariſons between God and Creatures; for though there is ſomething in Creatures like to what is in God, ſome faint Shadows and Images of it, yet nothing in Creatures is the ſame, that is in God: St. *Peter* exhorts Chriſtians, *As he which hath called you is holy, ſo be ye holy in all manner of Converſation*, 1 Peter 1. 15. And Chriſt commands us to *be perfect*, *as our Father which is in Heaven is perfect*, Matth. 5. 48. But can any Creature be holy and perfect as God is? Will you hence conclude, that Holineſs is not the immutable Nature of God, but the free choice of his Will; not his Nature, which is One pure ſimple Act, but an Habit of Vertue, becauſe ſo it is in us; and yet we muſt be holy and perfect as God is, which cannot be, (according to this way of Reaſoning) unleſs holineſs in God be the ſame holineſs, which is in Creatures; and indeed we may as well conclude this, as that the Oneneſs between the Father and the Son is only a Moral Union in Will and Affe-

Affection, becauſe there can be no other Union between Chriſtians, and yet Chriſt prays, That they may be One, as He and his Father are One: Since this Phraſe, *As thou Father art in me, and I in thee*, does evidently ſignifie a great deal more, than ſuch a Moral Union of Will and Affections, why ſhould they not as well conclude, that Chriſt prays for ſuch an eſſential Oneneſs between Chriſtians, as there is between him and his Father, as that the Father and the Son are One in no higher and more perfect ſenſe, than what is applicable to the Unity of Chriſtians with each other? There may be ſuch a likeneſs and reſemblance between natural and moral Unions, between the Acts and Perfections of Nature, and the Vertues of the Will and Choice, as may be a juſt foundation for a compariſon; but he is a very abſurd Reaſoner, who from ſuch a compariſon will conclude, they are the ſame. We are required *to love our Neighbour as our ſelves*; but will any Man hence conclude, that the love of our ſelves, and the love of our Neighbour, are of the ſame kind? Which is manifeſtly falſe: Self-love being a natural and neceſſary Paſſion; the love of our Neighbour a Chriſtian Vertue; the firſt the effect of Nature, the ſecond of Grace; but the effects ſo like each other, that they may well be compared, and the natural principle, which acts moſt equally and neceſſarily and perfectly, may be made the Rule and Meaſure of Brotherly Love: Thus this eſſential Unity between the Father and the Son, produces the moſt perfect Harmony and Union of Will and Affections, and therefore is the moſt perfect Pattern of that Moral Union, which ought to be among Chriſtians.

For

For we may obſerve, that this Oneneſs between the Father and the Son, is not the only natural and eſſential Unity, which is made the Pattern of Unity among Chriſtians: the Unity of the natural Body, and the vital ſympathy and fellow-feeling, which all the Members of the ſame natural Body have for each other, is propoſed as a Pattern alſo of that mutual Love and Affection between Chriſtians, 1 *Cor.* 12. 12.—27. And yet no Man will be ſo abſurd as to ſay: That either Chriſtians are as naturally and vitally united to each other, as the Members of a natural Body are; or that the Members of the natural Body are united only by mutual Love and Affection, as Chriſtians are.

This is ſufficient to ſhew, how Father and Son are One, by a mutual Conſciouſneſs, whereby they are as intimate to each other, as every Man is to himſelf, who knows all that is in himſelf, and feels all the motions and workings of his own Mind; and we need not doubt, but the Holy Spirit is in the ſame manner One with Father and Son: But I muſt not expect, that the Adverſaries I have to deal with, will grant any thing, which is not proved, and therefore I ſhall not ſtand to their Courteſie, but briefly prove this alſo.

St. *Paul* tells us, 1 *Cor.* 2. 10. *That the Spirit ſearcheth all things, yea the deep things of God:* So that the Holy Spirit knows all that is in God, even his moſt deep and ſecret Counſels, which is an argument, that he is very intimate with him; but this is not all, it is the manner of knowing, which muſt prove this Conſciouſneſs, of which I ſpeak; and that the Apoſtle adds in the next Verſe, that the Spirit of God knows all that is in God, juſt as the Spirit of a Man

Man knows all that is in Man; that is, not by external revelation or communication of this knowledge, but by Self-conſciouſneſs, by an internal Senſation, which is owing to an eſſential Unity: *v.* 11. *For what man knoweth the things of a man, ſave the ſpirit of a man which is in him; even ſo the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God.* So that the Spirit of God is as much within God, and as intimate to him, as the Spirit of Man is in Man; that is, by an eſſential Oneneſs, and Self-conſciouſneſs. And as the Spirit knoweth the deep things of God, ſo God *who ſearcheth the hearts, knoweth the mind of the ſpirit* too, 8 *Rom.* 27. So that the Father and the Holy Ghoſt are mutually conſcious to each other, as a Man and his own Spirit are; and then we need not doubt but the Holy Spirit, which is the Spirit of the Son, as well as of the Father, is as intimate to the Son alſo: and therefore Chriſt tells us of the Spirit: *He ſhall glorifie me, for he ſhall receive of mine, and ſhall ſhew it unto you, all things that the Father hath are mine, therefore ſaid I, he ſhall take of mine, and ſhall ſhew it unto you,* 16 John 14. 15. So that the Holy Spirit receives the things of Chriſt; But how does he receive them? Juſt as Chriſt receives them of the Father: the ſame things and the ſame way; not by an external communication, but by an eſſential Oneneſs and Conſciouſneſs of all that is in the Father and in the Son.

This ſeems to me to be the true Scripture-account of the numerical Unity of the Divine Eſſence, and to make a Trinity in Unity as intelligible as the Notion of One God is; but becauſe all that I have to ſay, turns upon this, I ſhall more particular explain this Notion: 1. By ſhewing that this contains the true

Orthodox Faith of the Holy Trinity. 2. That it gives a plain and intelligible Solution of all the Difficulties and ſeeming Contradictions in the Doctrine of the Trinity.

I. This contains the true Orthodox Faith of the Holy Trinity, or a Trinity in Unity; for ſo the *Athanaſian* Creed teaches us, To *worſhip One God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity, neither confounding the Perſons, nor dividing the Subſtance, for there is One Perſon of the Father, another of the Son, another of the Holy Ghoſt, but the Godhead of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt is all One, the Glory equal, the Majeſty co-eternal.*

There are two things then, which an Orthodox Chriſtian muſt take care of, neither to confound the Perſons, nor to divide the Subſtance; that is, to acknowledge Three diſtinct Perſons, and yet but One God; and nothing can be more apparent than both theſe, in that account which I have given of the Ever Bleſſed Trinity.

1. It is plain the Perſons are perfectly diſtinct, for they are Three diſtinct and infinite Minds, and therefore Three diſtinct Perſons; for a Perſon is an intelligent Being, and to ſay, they are Three Divine Perſons, and not Three diſtinct infinite Minds, is both Hereſie and Nonſenſe: The Scripture, I'm ſure, repreſents Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt, as Three intelligent Beings, not as Three Powers or Faculties of the ſame Being, which is down-right *Sabellianiſm*; for Faculties are not Perſons, no more than Memory, Will, and Underſtanding, are Three Perſons in One Man: When we prove the Holy Ghoſt to be a Perſon, againſt the *Socinians*, who make him only a Divine

vine Power, we prove that all the Properties of a Perſon belong to him, ſuch as Underſtanding, Will, Affections, and Actions; which ſhews what our Notion of a Perſon is, ſuch a Being as has Underſtanding, and Will, and Power of Action, and it would be very ſtrange, that we ſhould own Three Perſons, each of which Perſons is truly and properly God, and not own Three infinite Minds; as if any thing could be a God, but an infinite Mind.

And the diſtinction between theſe Three Infinite Minds is plain according to this Notion; for they are diſtinguiſhed, juſt as Three finite, and created Minds are, by Self conſciouſneſs: They are united indeed into One (as I have already diſcourſed) by a mutual Conſciouſneſs to each other, which no created Spirits have, which are conſcious only to the actings of their own Minds, not to each others, and therefore theſe Three Divine Perſons are not ſeparate Minds, as created Spirits are, but only diſtinct: each Divine Perſon has a Self-conſciouſneſs of its own, and knows and feels it ſelf (if I may ſo ſpeak) as diſtinct from the other Divine Perſons; the Father has a Self-conſciouſneſs of his own, whereby he knows and feels himſelf to be the Father, and not the Son, nor the Holy Ghoſt; and the Son in like manner feels himſelf to be the Son, and not the Father, nor the Holy Ghoſt; and the Holy Ghoſt feels himſelf to be the Holy Ghoſt, and not the Father, nor the Son; as *James* feels himſelf to be *James* and not *Peter*, nor *John*; which proves them to be diſtinct Perſons: Which is a very plain account, how theſe Three Divine Perſons are diſtinct, that *there is One Father, not Three Fathers, One Son, not Three Sons: One Holy Ghoſt, not Three Holy Ghoſts.* Here is no confounding of Perſons.

2. Nor do we divide the Subſtance, but unite theſe Three Perſons, in One numerical Eſſence: for we know nothing of the unity of the Mind but ſelf-conſciouſneſs, as I ſhewed before; and therefore as the ſelf-conſciouſneſs of every Perſon to it ſelf makes them diſtinct Perſons, ſo the mutual conſciouſneſs of all Three Divine Perſons to each other makes them all but One infinite God: as far as conſciouſneſs reaches, ſo far the unity of a Spirit extends, for we know no other unity of a Mind or Spirit, but conſciouſneſs: In a created Spirit this conſciouſneſs extends only to it ſelf, and therefore ſelf-conſciouſneſs makes it One with it ſelf, and divides and ſeparates it from all other Spirits; but could this conſciouſneſs extend to other Spirits, as it does to it ſelf, all theſe Spirits, which were mutually conſcious to each other, as they are to themſelves, though they were diſtinct Perſons, would be eſſentially One: And this is that eſſential unity, which is between Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, who are eſſentially united by a mutual conſciouſneſs to whatever is in each other, and do by an internal ſenſation (I want other words to expreſs it by) feel each other, as they do themſelves; and therefore are as eſſentially One, as a Mind and Spirit is One with it ſelf,

2. This is a very plain and intelligble account of this great and venerable Myſtery, as plain and intelligible as the Notion of One God, or of One Perſon in the Godhead,

The great difficulty of conceiving a Trinity of Perſons in One infinite and undivided Eſſence or Subſtance ariſes from thoſe groſs and material Idea's we have of Eſſence and Subſtance, when we ſpeak of the Eſſence or Subſtance of God, or created Spirits: We

We can frame no Idea of Subſtance, but what we have from Matter; that it is ſomething extended in a tripple dimenſion, in length, and breath, and depth, which is the ſubject of thoſe Qualities, which inhere and ſubſiſt in it: And therefore as Matter is the ſubject of all ſenſible Qualities, ſo we conceive ſome ſuch Subſtance of a Mind and Spirit, which is the ſubject of Will and Underſtanding, of Thoughts and Paſſions: And then we find it impoſſible to conceive, how there ſhould be Three Divine Perſons, which are all infinite, without Three diſtinct infinite Subſtances, each diſtinct infinite Perſon having a diſtinct infinite Subſtance of his own; and if we grant this, it ſeems a plain contradiction to ſay, That theſe Three diſtinct infinite Subſtances, are but One numerical infinite Subſtance; which is to ſay, that Three Infinites are but One Infinite, and that Three Perſons are but One Perſon; for a Perſon and an intelligent Subſtance are reciprocal Terms, and therefore Three diſtinct Perſons are Three diſtinct numerical Subſtances, and One numerical intelligent Subſtance is but One numerical Perſon.

But this is all carnal Reaſon in a ſtrict and proper ſenſe, which conceives of an infinite Mind after the manner of a Body, and diſtinguiſhes between the Matter or Subſtance, and the Powers and Vertues of the Divine Eſſence, as it does between Matter and Qualities and Accidents in Bodies. We know nothing of the Divine Eſſence, but that God is an infinite Mind; and if we ſeek for any other Eſſence or Subſtance in God, but an infinite Mind, that is, infinite Wiſdom, Power, and Goodneſs, the Eſſence of God though conſidered but as One numerical Perſon, is as perfectly unintelligible to us, as the One numerical Eſſence

Eſſence or Subſtance of Three Divine Perſons in the Ever Bleſſed Trinity.

It is this groſs and material imagination about the Eſſence or Subſtance of the Deity, which occaſions all the Difficulties about the Notion of One God, as well as of a Trinity in Unity: For we cannot imagine how any Subſtance ſhould be without a beginning; how it ſhould be preſent in all places without Parts, and without Extenſion; how Subſtance, Eſſence, Exiſtence, and all Divine Attributes and Powers, which are diſtinct things in created Spirits, ſhould be all the ſame, one ſimple Act in God, and yet Reaſon tells us we muſt allow of no Compoſition, no Qualities or Accidents in the Divine Nature, for a compounded Being muſt have Parts, and muſt be made, for that which has Parts muſt have ſome Maker to join the Parts together, and to endow it with ſuch Qualities and Powers.

But now if we conſider God as Wiſdom and Truth, which is his true Nature and Eſſence, without confounding our Minds with ſome material conceptions of his Subſtance, theſe things are plain and eaſie: For it is demonſtrable, that Truth is eternal, had no beginning, no Maker; for when we ſpeak of original and eſſential Truth and Wiſdom, what was not always Truth and Wiſdom, could never begin to be ſo: And if Truth be the only real thing, and neceſſarily eternal, there is an eternal Mind, which is nothing elſe but eternal Truth; for he, who can imagine, Truth and Wiſdom to be eternal, without an eternal Mind, ought not to pretend to either, unleſs he can tell us, how Truth can ſubſiſt without a Mind. Thus it is demonſtrable, that Truth and Wiſdom has no Parts, no Extenſion, no more than Thought has; Truth

and

and Wiſdom is confined to no place, fills no ſpace, but is every-where the ſame without Extenſion and Parts, and therefore has a neceſſary and eſſential Omnipreſence :- There is a faint reſemblance of this in finite and created Spirits ; even humane Wiſdom and Reaſon, Thoughts, and Paſſions, have no Extenſion nor Parts, which is a good argument that a created Spirit has no Extenſion and Parts neither, for nothing which has Extenſion nor Parts can be the ſubject of that which has none : All the Qualities of Bodies are extended as Bodies are; for the Properties and Qualities of all Things muſt conform to the Nature of the Subject in which they are ; and therefore Faculties, Powers, and Operations, which have no Extenſion or Parts, as the Will, the Underſtanding, the Memory, the Thoughts and Paſſions have none, muſt be ſeated, in a Subject which has no Parts nor Extenſion neither. Thus Thought is confined to no place, but in a Minute ſurrounds the Earth, and aſcends above the Heavens, and viſits all the empty Capacities of infinite ſpace ; which is an imperfect imitation of the Omnipreſence of an Infinite Mind.

Thus what can be a more pure and ſimple Act than Wiſdom and Truth? Now though we conceive the Divine Attributes and Perfections under different Notions and Characters, ſuch as Wiſdom, Love, Juſtice, Goodneſs, Power, they are indeed nothing elſe but Infinite Truth and Wiſdom, which receives ſeveral Characters and Denominations from its different effects ; as the ſame Sea or River does different Names from the Countries by which it paſſes: For what is intellectual Love, but the perfect Idea's of Truth, or the true knowledge and eſtimation of Things? What is Juſtice and Goodneſs, but an equal diſtribution of Things,

Things, or a true and wiſe proportion of Rewards and Puniſhments? What is perfect Power, but perfect Truth and Wiſdom, which can do, whatever it knows? This laſt will not be ſo eaſily underſtood, becauſe in Men we find Knowledge and Power to be very different things, that Men may know a great deal, which they cannot do: And yet if we conſider this matter over again, we ſhall find it a miſtake: For even among Men it is only Knowledge that is Power. Humane Power, and humane Knowledge, as that ſignifies a Knowledge how to do any thing, are commenſurate; whatever humane Skill extends to, humane Power can effect; nay, every Man can do, what he knows how to do, if he have proper Inſtruments and Materials to do it with; but what no humane Power can do, no humane Knowledge knows how to do: We know not what the Subſtance or Eſſence of any thing is, nor can we make any Subſtance; we cannot create any thing of nothing, nor do we know, how it is to be done; which ſhews, that Knowledge and Power in Creatures are equal, and that proves a very near relation between them, eſpecially when we add, that Knowledge is not only the Director of Power, but is that very Power which we call Force: For it is nothing but Thought which moves our Bodies, and all the Members of them, which are the immediate Inſtruments of all humane Force and Power, excepting mechanical motions, which do not depend upon our Wills, ſuch as the motion of the Heart, the circulation of the Blood, the concoction of our Meat, and the like: all voluntary motions are not only directed, but cauſed by Thought; and ſo indeed it muſt be, or there could be no motion in the World; for Matter cannot move it ſelf, and there-

therefore ſome Mind muſt be the firſt Mover; which makes it very plain, that infinite Truth and Wiſdom is Infinite and Almighty Power. So that if we ſet aſide all material Images of Eſſence and Subſtance, and contemplate God as Eternal Truth and Wiſdom, the Notion of a God is very plain and eaſie, as far as we are concerned to know him in this ſtate.

The ſame cauſe has confounded and perplext the Notion of a Trinity in Unity, and given occaſion to ſome vain and arrogant Pretenders to Reaſon, profanely to deride and ridicule that moſt Sacred and Venerable Myſtery.

They puzzle and confound themſelves with ſome groſs and corporeal Idea's of Eſſence and Subſtance, and how Three Divine Perſons can ſubſiſt diſtinct in the ſame numerical Subſtance, but would they but conſider the Three Divine Perſons, as Three Infinite Minds, diſtinguiſhed from each other by a ſelf-conſciouſneſs of their own, and eſſentially united by a mutual conſciouſneſs to each other, which is the only way of diſtinguiſhing and uniting Minds and Spirits, and then a Trinity in Unity is a very plain and intelligible Notion.

Now certainly this is much the moſt reaſonable way: For what the Eſſence and Subſtance of a Spirit is, when we diſtinguiſh it from Underſtanding and Will, which we call the Powers and Faculties of a Spirit; for my part, I know not, no more than I do, what the naked Eſſence and Subſtance of Matter is, ſtript of all its Qualities and Accidents: as I obſerved before, the naked Eſſences of Things are not the Objects of our Knowledge, and therefore it is ridiculous to diſpute about them, to ſay peremptorily what is, or what is not, in Matters, which we know nothing

of: And therefore as we frame the Notion of Bodies from their external and ſenſible Qualities, ſo we muſt frame the Notion of a Spirit from its intellectual Powers, of Will, and Underſtanding, *&c.* And when we diſpute about the diſtinction or union of Spirits, we muſt not diſpute how their Subſtances, which we know nothing of, can be diſtinguiſht or united, but how two Minds conſidered as intellectual Beings, are diſtinguiſhed and united, and then there will appear no difficulty or abſurdity, in the eſſential union of Three Minds by a mutual conſciouſneſs to each other.

That the eſſential unity of a Spirit conſiſts in ſelf-conſciouſneſs, every Man may feel in himſelf, for it is nothing elſe which makes a Spirit One, and diſtinguiſhes it from all other Spirits; and therefore if Two Spirits were conſcious to all that is in each other, as they are to what they feel in themſelves, they would be united to each other by the ſame kind of unity, which makes every individual Spirit One: And why then ſhould not this be thought an eſſential unity between the Divine Perſons of the Ever Bleſſed Trinity?

And is there any difficulty in conceiving this, that Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt ſhould be thus intimately conſcious to each other? The Scripture plainly aſſerts that it is ſo, as I have already proved, and there is no impoſſibility in the thing; nay, if we will allow Three infinite Minds, it is impoſſible it ſhould be otherwiſe.

A finite created Spirit indeed is conſcious only to it ſelf, and not to any other created Spirits; but God, who is an infinite Mind, is conſcious to all created Spirits, dwells within us, and ſees all our Thoughts and

and Motions, and Paſſions, as perfectly as we do our own; how he does this we know not, that he does ſo, the Scripture aſſures us, and that there is nothing impoſſible in it, our Reaſon will tell us; for certainly that infinite Mind, which made all finite Spirits, can ſee them too; that is, ſee all the Thoughts and Paſſions of a Spirit, which is the only way of ſeeing a Spirit; and that can be no infinite Mind which does not; for there is ſomething, which it does not know, if it does not know our Thoughts.

If then it be eſſential to an infinite Mind to be conſcious to all Spirits, if we allow, that there are Three infinite Minds, we muſt grant, that they are mutually conſcious to each other: though an infinite Mind is conſcious to all that is in created Spirits, yet there is not a mutual conſciouſneſs, and therefore no eſſential unity between them, for created Spirits are not conſcious to an infinite Mind, as it is impoſſible they ſhould, unleſs they were infinite themſelves; for a Mind which is conſcious to an infinite Mind; that is, a Mind which comprehends an infinite Mind, muſt be infinite: But it is a contradiction to ſay, there are Three infinite Minds, unleſs they are mutually conſcious to each other; for if there be any thing in one, which is not in the other, they cannot both be infinite, unleſs one infinite can be greater than another.

The truth is, we have no poſitive Notion of Infinity, but only in a Mind, and it is impoſſible to conceive any Three Beings that are infinite, but only Three infinite Minds; and Three Minds may be infinite, but then they muſt be mutually ſelf-conſcious, or they cannot all be infinite.

When we think of an infinite Being, we are presently confounded with the corporeal Images of an infinite Substance, or a Substance infinitely extended; and this we can make nothing of; for indeed it is demonstrable, that there can be no such thing. We have an imagination of infinite space, which we can set no bounds to, but how far soever we extend our thoughts, we can still imagine something beyond that; but then we have no Notion, that space is any thing, but only a capacity to receive something; nay, it seems to me, to be nothing else, but an imaginary Idea of Extension separated from Body and Matter; as we conceive place to be distinct from the Body, which fills the place, and therefore, that if the Body were annihilated, place would remain still of the same dimensions, which the Body had, that filled it; and this is the conception of an imaginary space infinitely extended. But it is as plain as any demonstration, that no real Being is infinitely extended; for there is, and can be no actual Extension infinite: The Extension of a real Being must really and actually be, and yet there is not a more self-evident Proposition than this, that there is no Extension so great but that it may be extended farther, and then there can be no such thing in Being, as an infinite Extension, for if there were, there would be such an Extension, as could not be extended farther, unless we can extend that, which is actually infinite already. We may easily observe, what it is, that cheats us into the Opinion of infinite Extension, as if there were such a real thing: *viz.* That we cannot see to the end of all possible Extension, we cannot extend our Thoughts so far, but we can imagine something farther, and therefore we fancy, that there is something infinitely ex-

extended, though we cannot comprehend it, or ſee to the end of it, which would be a contradiction, to ſee to the end of that which has none: But we ſhould obſerve, that it is not the defect of our Imagination, that we cannot conceive an infinite Extenſion; but Reaſon tells us, that there neither is, nor can be, any ſuch Extenſion, but what may be extended farther; now what cannot be, cannot be a real thing, for whatever is real, is.

It is exactly the ſame caſe in Numbers: There neither is, nor can be an infinite Number, becauſe there is no Number ſo great, nor can any Number be ſo great, but it may be made greater by adding to it; ſo that Numbers, Extenſion, and the ſame may be ſaid of Time and Succeſſion, are called infinite, not that they have any real and poſitive infinity, but becauſe we can add to them without end; which is a demonſtration, that they neither are, nor can be infinite, for what is infinite, is capable of no additions; and there can be no Number, Extenſion, or ſucceſſive Duration, but what is capable of infinite additions, and therefore is at an infinite diſtance from being infinite.

By this time, I ſuppoſe, every one is convinc'd, that infinite Extenſion does not belong to the Idea of a God, becauſe there is no ſuch thing in Nature; and if infinite Extenſion does not, no Extenſion can; for nothing is God, but what is infinite.

Though the truth is, this very word *infinite* confounds our Notions of God, and makes the moſt perfect and excellent Being, the moſt perfectly unknown to us: For infinite is only a negative term, and ſignifies that, which has no end, no bounds, no meaſure, and therefore no poſitive and determined Nature, and therefore

therefore is nothing; that *an infinite Being*, had not uſe and cuſtom reconciled us to that Expreſſion, would be thought Nonſenſe and Contradiction; for every real Being has a certain and determined Nature; and therefore is not infinite in this ſenſe, which is ſo far from being a perfection, that it ſignifies nothing real.

But ſince Cuſtom has made it neceſſary to uſe this word, it is neceſſary to explain what we mean by it: That *an infinite Being* ſignifies a Being abſolutely perfect, or which has all poſſible Perfections: which has no other end of its Perfections, but Perfection it ſelf; that is a finite imperfect Being, that wants any Perfections; that is an infinite Being, not which has no end of its Perfections, but which actually has all Perfections, and can be no more perfect than it is: For there is a meaſure of the moſt abſolute, and in this ſenſe infinite Perfections, before which no Being is abſolutely perfect, and beyond which there are no new degrees of Perfection; for if we do not grant this, there can be no Being abſolutely perfect.

As for inſtance: Infinite Wiſdom, Knowledge, Goodneſs, Juſtice, Power, have fixt and ſet bounds to their Perfections, beyond which they cannot go: Infinite Knowledge and Wiſdom knows all things, that are knowable, and that are wiſe; infinite Goodneſs can do all things which are Good; infinite Juſtice is perfect Juſtice, which obſerves the exact proportions of Right and Wrong; infinite Power can do all things, which can be done: To know, what is not to be known, to do what is not to be done, to be good or juſt beyond the perfect Meaſures of Goodneſs and Juſtice, is a contradiction; for it is neither Wiſdom, nor Power, nor Goodneſs, nor Juſtice: The Nature

of

of Wiſdom, Power, Juſtice, and Goodneſs, is fixt and determined, and the utmoſt bounds of them is abſolute Perfection: The Divine Nature is the Original Rule and Standard, and utmoſt Bounds of them, and therefore abſolutely perfect. Theſe Perfections indeed may be called infinite in the Negative ſenſe, with reſpect to us, that we know not, what the utmoſt extent of them are: We know not how far infinite Wiſdom, and Power, and Goodneſs reaches, but then we certainly know, that they have their bounds, and that the Divine Nature is the utmoſt bounds of them; for nothing can be a Rule and Meaſure of abſolute Perfections, but the Divine Nature it ſelf: Now this gives us a poſitive Notion and Idea of God, though we cannot comprehend his abſolute Perfections; we as certainly know, what God is, as we know, what Wiſdom, Knowledge, Power, Goodneſs, Juſtice ſignifie; but how Wiſe, how Good, how Powerful God is, we know not, becauſe we do not know the utmoſt extent of theſe Perfections.

I muſt now add, that there can be no abſolute Perfections, but thoſe of a Mind, ſuch as I have ſo often mentioned, Wiſdom, Power, Goodneſs: As for Matter, it is ſo imperfect a Being it ſelf, that it cannot be the ſubject of abſolute Perfections: Nothing which belongs to Matter is a Perfection, conſidered in it ſelf; Extenſion is no Perfection, no more than the dimenſions of a Body are, to be long, or broad, or deep, to be little or great, which may be Perfections or Imperfections, as it happens, with relation to the juſt meaſures and proportions of different Bodies; for either greatneſs or littleneſs may make different things monſtrous, and therefore neither of them are either Beauties or Perfections themſelves; for what is in it ſelf a Perfection is always ſo. Ex-

Extenſion is of no uſe, but where there is a multitude or diverſity of Parts, and ſuch a compound Being can never be abſolutely perfect, becauſe it is made of Parts, which are not abſolutely perfect, as no Part can be; and ten thouſand imperfect Parts can never make up an abſolutely perfect Being: And if what is infinitely perfect can have no Parts, it needs no Extenſion, and can have none; for what is extended has aſſignable Parts, whether they can be divided or not.

Omnipreſence is a great and unqueſtionable Perfection, but to be Omnipreſent by infinite Extenſion, (if ſuch a thing could be) would be no Perfection at all; for this would be to be preſent only by Parts; as a Body might be, which is infinitely extended, and a Body is as capable of infinite Extenſion, as any Man can conceive a Spirit to be; and yet if a Spirit be Omnipreſent only by infinite Extenſion, the whole Subſtance of that Spirit is not preſent every where, but part of it is in one place, and part in another, as many Miles diſtant from each other as the places are, where ſuch parts of the Omnipreſent Spirit are. This all Men will confeſs to be abſurd; and yet if the whole Mind and Spirit be preſent every where, it is certain, it is not preſent every where by way of Extenſion; for the whole Extenſion of an infinitely extended Spirit is not preſent every where: And if Omnipreſence it ſelf cannot be owing to infinite Extenſion, no Man can tell me, why an infinite Mind ſhould be extended at all: for Extenſion it ſelf is no Perfection. Much leſs do any other Vertues and Qualities of Bodies deſerve the Name of abſolute Perfections, and therefore we muſt ſeek for abſolute perfection only in a Mind; perfect Wiſdom, Knowledge, Power, Goodneſs,

neſs, Juſtice, make an abſolute perfect Mind; there are no other abſolute Perfections but theſe, and therefore there can be no other abſolutely perfect Being, but an infinite Mind.

But beſides this we may obſerve, that all theſe abſolute Perfections, by a mutual Conſciouſneſs, may be entire and equal in three diſtinct infinite Minds: There is no contradiction, that three infinite Minds ſhould be abſolutely perfect in Wiſdom, Goodneſs, Juſtice, and Power; for theſe are Perfections, which may be in more than One, as Three Men may all know the ſame things, and be equally juſt and good: But Three ſuch Minds cannot be abſolutely perfect without being mutually conſcious to each other, as they are to themſelves; for if they do not perfectly know each other, as they know themſelves, their Wiſdom and Knowledge is not abſolutely perfect; for they do not know all things, if they do not perfectly know one another, and there can be no ſuch perfect Knowledge of each other, without a mutual Conſciouſneſs.

This ſhews not only the poſſibility of this Notion, that Three diſtinct infinite Minds ſhould be mutually Conſcious to each other, but the neceſſity of it, if there be Three ſuch infinitely perfect Minds; for they cannot be infinitely perfect, without being Conſcious to one another.

Thus to proceed: This Notion plainly reconciles the perfect equality of all Three Perſons, with the Prerogative of the Father, and the Subordination of the Son and Holy Spirit. That all Three Perſons are perfectly equal in Knowledge, Wiſdom, Goodneſs, Juſtice, Power, is evident from their mutual Conſciouſneſs, whereby they all know, love, and do

the ſame things, which is a perfect equality: But this does not deſtroy the natural Subordination of the Son to the Father, of a derivative to an original Light, as Chriſt is called in the *Nicene* Creed, *God of God, Light of Light:* For though God has communicated his own Nature to him, and received him into his Boſom, to an intimate conſciouſneſs with himſelf, which makes him the perfect Image of his Father; yet he receives all this from his Father by eternal Generation, he is a Son ſtill, though equal to his Father in all Divine Perfections, and therefore ſubordinate to him as a Son: And the like may be ſaid of the Holy Spirit.

This ſhews alſo, how theſe Three diſtinct Perſons are each of them God, and yet are all but One God. Each Perſon is God, for each Perſon has the whole and entire Perfections of the Godhead, having by this mutual conſciouſneſs, the other Perſons in himſelf, that each Perſon is in ſome ſenſe the whole Trinity: The Son is in the Father, and the Father in the Son, and the Holy Spirit in Father and Son, and Father and Son in the Holy Spirit; and therefore if the whole Trinity be God, the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghoſt God, they being all mutually in each other; and yet this is a plain demonſtration, that they are not Three Gods, but One God; becauſe neither of them are the One Supreme God, but as thus intimately united to all the reſt; and then they can be all Three, but One Supreme God: This gives an intelligible account of one of the moſt Difficult Problems in all School-Divinity, which the Maſter of the Sentences borrowed from St. *Auſtin*, as he has done moſt of his other Diſtinctions; that the whole Trinity is not greater, than any One Perſon

in

in the Trinity. This ſounds very harſhly at firſt hearing, and yet if we conſider it, we muſt confeſs it to be true, unleſs we will ſay, that there is a greater and leſs in God, or that the Three Perſons in the Trinity make One God, as three parts make a whole, each of which parts muſt be leſs than the whole; and yet I cannot ſee any poſſible way to underſtand this matter, but only this: That the whole Trinity by a mutual conſciouſneſs is in each Perſon, and therefore no Perſon is leſs than the whole Trinity.

And this is the only poſſible way of underſtanding the different *Modi ſubſiſtendi*, of which the Schools ſpeak: That the Three Divine Perſons have One numerical Eſſence, and are One God, but are diſtinguiſhed from each other by a diſtinct manner of Subſiſtence proper to each Perſon: It is plain, the Schoolmen were no *Sabellians*; they did not think the Three Divine Perſons, to be only Three Names of the ſame infinite Being; but acknowledged each Perſon to be really diſtinct from one another, and each of them to have the ſame numerical Eſſence, and to be truly and properly God, and not to be Three Modes of the ſame infinite God, which is little better than Three Names of One God.

And what are theſe *Modi ſubſiſtendi*, by which the Divine Perſons are diſtinguiſhed from each other? Now they are no other, than the proper and diſtinguiſhing Characters of each Perſon; that the Father is of himſelf, or without any cauſe; that the Son is begotten of the Father; that the Holy Ghoſt proceeds from Father and Son: Which proves that by theſe *Modi ſubſiſtendi*, they did not mean (as ſome miſtake them) that the Three Divine Perſons are Three Modes of the Deity, or only modally diſtinguiſhed,

for there are no Modes, no more than there are Qualities and Accidents, in the Deity, much leſs can a Mode be a God: To be ſure, all Men muſt grant, that the Father is not a Mode of the Deity, but eſſentially God, and yet he has his *Modus ſubſiſtendi*, as well as the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt; and no Man can think, that the Father begat only a *Modus*, and called it his Son, whereas a Son ſignifies a real Perſon of the ſame Nature, but diſtinct from his Father.

All then that can poſſibly be meant by theſe Modes of Subſiſtence is this, that the ſame numerical Eſſence is whole and entire in each Divine Perſon, but in a different manner; the Son and Holy Ghoſt are in the Father, as the One is begotten, the other proceeds from him, and yet both remain in him by an intimate conſciouſneſs; and thus you have often heard, all Three Perſons are in each other, and therefore are numerically One; the Father has the Son and Holy Ghoſt in himſelf as the Fountain of the Deity, the Son begotten of the Father, the Holy Ghoſt proceeding from Father and Son. That is, there are Three infinite Minds, which are diſtinguiſhed from each other by the relations of Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, the Father begets, the Son is begotten, the Holy Ghoſt proceeds, which are their different Modes of ſubſiſting; but each of theſe infinite Minds has the other Two in himſelf, by an intimate and mutual Conſciouſneſs, and that makes all Three Perſons numerically One Divine Eſſence, or One God; for when the whole Trinity is in each diſtinct Perſon, each Perſon is the ſame One numerical God, and all of them but One God: If the Father, for inſtance, have his own perſonal Wiſdom, and by an internal con-

conſciouſneſs, all the Wiſdom of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt; and the Son have his own perſonal Wiſdom, and by the ſame Conſciouſneſs, all the Wiſdom of the Father, and the Holy Ghoſt; and in like manner, the Holy Ghoſt have his own perſonal Wiſdom, and all the Wiſdom of Father, and Son; this infinite Wiſdom which is in Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, is identically the ſame: For from which Perſon ſoever you begin to reckon this Union, it is the ſame Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt ſtill, which are thus intimately united into One; and therefore it is the ſame numerical and identical Wiſdom, which is in each of them, and the ſame in all.

To add no more: This Notion gives a plain account too of that Maxim of the Schools, That all the Operations of the Trinity, *ad extra*, are common to all Three Perſons; for it cannot poſſibly be otherwiſe, when they are thus intimately united by a mutual Conſciouſneſs; for they can no more act, than they can ſubſiſt ſeparately; when the Wiſdom, Goodneſs, Juſtice, Power of the whole Trinity is entire in each Perſon, and the ſame in all, every Perſon of the Trinity muſt be equally concerned, ſaving the Natural Order, and Subordination of Perſons, in all the external Effects and Operations of the Divine Wiſdom, Juſtice, Goodneſs, and Power.

Thus I have endeavoured to explain this Great and Venerable Myſtery of a Trinity in Unity; and this I may ſay, that I have given not only a very poſſible and a very intelligible Notion of it, but ſuch alſo as is very agreeable to the Phraſe and Expreſſions of Scripture, ſuch as preſerves the Majeſty of the Article, and ſolves all the Difficulties of it; there may be a great

great deal more in this Myſtery, than we can fathom, but thus much we can underſtand of it, and that is enough to reconcile us to this belief, and to ſhame and ſilence the profane Scoffers at a Trinity in Unity; as I have in part ſhewn already, and will do now more fully, by proceeding to anſwer thoſe many Abſurdities and Contradictions charged on it by *the Brief Notes*: To proceed then where I left off.

Creed. *There is One Perſon of the Father, another of the Son, another of the Holy Ghoſt.*

Notes. *Then the Son is not the Father, nor is the Father the Son, nor the Holy Ghoſt either of them.*

Anſwer. I grant it: Their Perſons are diſtinct, and therefore are not each other, but they are all eſſentially united by a mutual Conſciouſneſs, whereby they are mutually in each other, and can be no more ſeparated from each other, than every Man's own Mind can be divided from it ſelf.

Anſwer. *But if the Father is not the Son, and yet is (by confeſſion of all) the One true God, then the Son is not the One true God, becauſe he is not the Father: The reaſon is ſelf-evident, for how can the Son be the One true God, if he be not He, who is the One true God. After the ſame manner it may be proved, that (on the* Athanaſian *Principles) neither the Father, nor Holy Spirit, are, or can be God, or the One true God; for neither of them is the Son, who is the One true God, according to* Athanaſius, *and all* Trinitarians; *for they all ſay, The Father is the One true God, the Son is the One true God, and the Holy Ghoſt the One true God; which*

which is a threefold Contradiction, becauſe there is but One true God, and One of theſe Perſons is not the other. But if it be a Contradiction it is certainly falſe, for every Contradiction, being made up of Inconſiſtencies, deſtroys it ſelf, and is its own Confutation.

This is meer trick and fallacy, or miſrepreſentation. To have made his Argument conclude, he ſhould have ſaid: The Father is not the Son, and yet the Perſon of the Father conſidered not only as diſtinguiſhed, but as divided and ſeparated from the Perſon of the Son, is the One true God, and then the Son is not the One true God, becauſe he is not the Father: And then indeed his reaſon had been ſelf-evident, that the Perſon of the Son, as ſeparated from the Perſon of the Father, is not the One true God, becauſe the Perſon of the Son is not the Perſon of the Father, who is the One true God: But neither *Athanaſius*, nor any of the *Trinitarians* ever ſaid this, That the Perſon of the Father, as ſeparated from the Perſons of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt, is the One true God; or that the Perſon of the Son as ſeparated from the Perſons of the Father, and of the Holy Ghoſt is the One true God; or that the Perſon of the Holy Ghoſt as ſeparated from the Perſons of the Father, and of the Son, is the One true God; for we conſtantly affirm, that Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, by an intimate and inſeparable Union to each other, are but One true God; but as their Perſons can never be ſeparated, ſo they muſt never be conſidered in a ſeparate ſtate, and if we will imagine ſuch an impoſſible abſurdity as this, neither of them are the One true God; for whoever ſeparates them, deſtroys the Deity, and leaves neither Father, Son, nor Holy Ghoſt. *Anſwer.*

And

And yet if we conſider theſe Three Divine Perſons, as containing each other in themſelves, and eſſentially One by a mutual Conſciouſneſs, this pretended Contradiction vaniſhes: For then the Father is the One true God, becauſe the Father has the Son, and the Holy Spirit in himſelf; and the Son may be called the One true God (of which more preſently) becauſe the Son has the Father, and the Holy Ghoſt in himſelf; and the Holy Ghoſt the One true God, becauſe he has the Father and the Son in himſelf, and yet all but One true God, becauſe Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt are united into One; and then though *One of theſe Perſons is not the other*, yet each Perſon by an eſſential Unity contains both others in himſelf, and therefore if all Three Perſons are the One true God, each Perſon is God.

And this is the true meaning of the *Athanaſian* Creed, which this Author has corrupted by adding, *the One true* God to every Perſon; that *the Father is the One true God, the Son the One true God, the Holy Ghoſt the One true God*, as if each Perſon as diſtinguiſhed and ſeparated from the other, were the One true God; and then it would indeed ſound pretty like a Contradiction to add, yet there is but One true God: But the *Athanaſian* Creed only ſays, *The Father is God, the Son God, the Holy Ghoſt God; yet Three are not Three Gods, but One God*; which plainly ſhews, that it does not ſpeak of theſe Three Divine Perſons, as diſtinguiſhed and ſeparated from each other; but as united into One God, not as Three parts of the Deity, but as Three Perſons, who are eſſentially One God, as mutually containing each other; that is, by a mutual ſelf-conſciouſneſs, as I have now explained it, which is the eſſential Unity of a Mind.

As

As for this expreſſion, *The One true God*, it is never attributed to Son, or Holy Ghoſt, that I know of either in Scripture, or in any Catholick Writer; tho' it is to the Father, whom our Saviour himſelf calls, *The only true God*; for all Three Divine Perſons as in conjunction with each other, being *the One only true God*: This Title cannot ſo properly be attributed to any One Perſon but only the Father, who is the Fountain of the Deity: for though all Three Perſons are in each other by a mutual conſciouſneſs, and therefore each Perſon has all the Perfections of the Godhead; yet the Son is in the Father, and the Holy Spirit in the Father and the Son, in ſuch a manner, as the Father is not in the Son, nor the Father and Son in the Holy Spirit, which the Schools call the *Modi Subſiſtendi*; that is, the Son is in the Father by eternal generation, and the Holy Spirit in Father and Son by eternal proceſſion; and this is the natural Order of the Trinity; and therefore when this One God is to be ſignified by the Name of any One Perſon, it is proper to follow the Order of Nature, if I may ſo ſpeak, and to ſignifie the whole Sacred Trinity by the Name of the Father, who is the eternal Source and Fountain of it.

The Godhead of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt is all One, the Glory equal, the Majeſty coeternal. Creed.

The meaning of the laſt clauſe is, that the Glory and Majeſty of the Son and Holy Spirit is equal to the Glory and Majeſty of the Father, or the Son and Holy Spirit are equally Glorious and Majeſtical with God the Father. *Notes.*

Therefore I ask, whether the Glory and Majesty with which the Son and Spirit are Glorious and Majestical, be the same in number (that is, the very same) with which the Father is Glorious and Majestical, or only the same for kind or degree? If it be not the same in number, then the Godhead of the Father, and of the Son, is not (as this Creed teaches) all One, and they are not One and the same God: for Two infinite and distinct Glories and Majesties make Two Gods, and Three make Three Gods; as every One sees, and (to say true) the Trinitarians *themselves confess. It remains therefore that they say, that the Glory and Majesty of the Son and Spirit is the same in number, and not for kind and degree only, with that of the Father; but then it follows, that the Glory and Majesty of these Persons is neither equal, nor coeternal. Not equal, for 'tis the same, which equals never are. Not coeternal, for this also plainly intimates, that they are distinct; For how coeternal, if not distinct? Do we say a thing is coeternal, and cotemporary with it self? Therefore this Article also doth impugn and destroy it self: Besides, if the Glory and Majesty of the Three Persons be numerically the same, then so are all their other Attributes: from whence it follows, that there is not any real difference between the Three Persons, and they are only Three several Names of God, which is the Heresie of the* Sabellians.

Answer. What he says, That *if the Glory and Majesty of the Three Persons be numerically the same, so are all their other Attributes*, is certainly true; for their Glory and Majesty is nothing else, but the infinite Perfections of their Nature. And therefore to make short work with this, I affirm, that the Glory and Majesty,

ſty, and all the other Perfections of theſe Three Divine Perſons are as diſtinct as their Perſons are, and therefore may be coequal and coeternal, becauſe they are diſtinct, and yet they are as numerically One and the ſame as the Godhead is. They are Three infinite Minds, and therefore diſtinct as Three Minds are, but they are all mutually conſcious to each other, and therefore as Eſſentially One, as the ſame Mind is One with it ſelf by a ſelf-conſciouſneſs; this does not deſtroy the Diſtinction of their Perſons, nor conſequently of their Majeſty and Glory, their Glory and Majeſty is as diſtinct as their Perſons are, and united as their Perſons are, into One eſſential and numerical Glory of One Supreme God, a Trinity in Unity.

But to expoſe the ridiculous Sophiſtry of this, inſtead of *their Glory equal, their Majeſty coeternal*, let us put in their Perſons equal and coeternal, for the equality of their Glory, and coeternity of their Majeſty, is nothing elſe, but the equality and coeternity of their Perſons; that *the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt is all One, their Perſons equal and coeternal.* And then our Note-makers Argument runs thus:

" I ask, whether the Perſons of the Son, and of " the Holy Ghoſt, which are equal and coeternal " with the Perſon of the Father, be the ſame in num- " ber (that is, the very ſame) with the Perſon of the " Father, or only the ſame for kind and degree? If " they be not the ſame in number (that is, if they " be diſtinct Perſons, as the Creed affirms) then " the Godhead of the Father, and of the Son, is not " all One, and they are not One and the ſame God;

"for Two infinite and distinct Persons make Two "Gods, and Three make Three Gods. Is not this now, a self-evident proof, that there cannot be One Godhead, if there be Three Persons, because Three Persons make Three Gods! *Quod erat demonstrandum*; that is, it cannot be, because it cannot be: But to proceed with his Argument.

"It remains therefore, that these *Trinitarians* say, "That the Person of the Son and Spirit, is the same "in number, and not in kind or degree only, with "the Person of the Father. That is, because they affirm these Divine Persons to be distinct, therefore they must say, they are numerically the same; and what then? Why then they are neither equal, nor coeternal, because they are the same without any real distinction, and the same thing is not equal, nor coeternal with it self: Right! very right Sir! a plain demonstration! And thus the poor *Trinitarians* are eternally confounded! They teach, that there are Three distinct Persons, and One eternal and infinite God; he plainly confutes this by saying, That if there be One Godhead, there cannot be Three distinct Persons, for Three distinct Persons are Three Gods; and if he had proved it, as well as said it, it had been a direct confutation. They affirm, that these Three distinct Persons are coequal and coeternal; he proves, that they are not, because they must say, (though they say the quite contrary) that they are not Three, but One numerical Person, and then they cannot be coequal and coeternal: And thus they shamefully contradict themselves, and this Article is *Felo de se*: If this be the profound Reason of Hereticks, God deliver me from Heresie, if it were for no other Reason, but to keep my Understanding: And yet as ridiculous

lous as this looks, it is the whole of his Reaſoning; for if there be Three diſtinct coequal and coeternal Perſons, their Majeſty and Glory muſt be as diſtinct, coequal, coeternal, as their Perſons are, and united into One numerical eſſential Glory, as their Perſons are into One God; and how Three infinite Minds, or the Three Divine Perſons, or, which is the ſame thing, Three Divine Glories and Majeſties may be really diſtinct, and yet numerically One God, I have already explained at large.

In the next place this Creed teaches, That, "The "Father is Incomprehenſible, Uncreate, Eternal, Al- "mighty; the Holy Ghoſt is Incomprehenſible, Un- "create, Eternal, Almighty: Alſo, That each of "theſe Perſons is by himſelf God and Lord; ſo that "the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy "Ghoſt is God; yet there are not Three Gods, or "Lords, nor Three Incomprehenſibles, nor Three "Almighties, nor Three Eternals, nor Uncreated. Creed.

Now if in imitation of this, a Man ſhould have a mind to ſay: "The Father is a Perſon, the Son is a "Perſon, and the Holy Ghoſt is a Perſon: yet not "Three Perſons, but One Perſon. *I would know, why this were not as good Grammar and Arithmetick, as when* Athanaſius *ſays, The Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghoſt is God, yet not Three Gods, but One God; or when he ſays, The Father Uncreated, the Son Uncreated, the Holy Ghoſt Uncreated; yet not Three Uncreated, but One Uncreated. And ſo of the reſt?* *Notes.*

Doth not a Man contradict himſelf, when the Term or Terms in his Negation, are the ſame with thoſe in his

his Affirmation? If not, then it may be true, That "The Father is a Perſon, the Son is a Perſon, the "Holy Ghoſt is a Perſon, yet there are not Three "Perſons, but One Perſon: *For all the fault here is only this, that in the laſt clauſe the term Perſon is denied to belong to more than One, when in the firſt it had been affirmed of no fewer than Three.* For the ſame reaſon it muſt be a Contradiction to ſay, "The "Father is God, the Son is God, the Holy Ghoſt is "God, yet there are not Three Gods, but One God: *For the Term God is at laſt denied to belong to more than One, though in the firſt clauſe, it was affirmed of Three: Will they ſay, that in theſe words there are not Three Gods but One God, the term God is not denied to belong to more than One, or is not appropriated to One? If ſo then there are not Three Perſons, but One Perſon; and again, there are not Three Men, but One Man; then I ſay, theſe Propoſitions do not deny the terms* Perſon and Men *to belong to more than One, or appropriate them to One only, which yet every Body confeſſes they do.*

Anſwer. This Objection ſounds very formidably too, but proves nothing but the ſhameful ignorance and impudence of this Author, who undertakes to write Notes upon Creeds, and to ridicule the Venerable Myſteries of the Chriſtian Faith, before he underſtands them

For let us begin with the Adjectives firſt, ſuch as *Uncreated, Incomprehenſible, Eternal, Almighty*; and we need take under conſideration, but any One of theſe, and that will explain all the reſt, for there is the ſame account to be given of them all

The

The Father then is Uncreated, the Son Uncreated, the Holy Ghoſt Uncreated, and yet there are not Three Uncreated, but One Uncreated: Now to make this a Contradiction, that there are Three, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, Uncreated, and yet that there are not Three Uncreated, but One Uncreated, this term *Uncreated* muſt be applied to the ſame ſubject, and affirmed and denied in the ſame ſenſe: Now when Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, are ſaid to be Uncreated, this term *Uncreated* is applied to the Three Divine Perſons; and if Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, are Uncreated, it is certain, there are Three Divine Perſons *Uncreated*; and had it been ſaid in the Creed, that there are not Three Divine Perſons Uncreated, it had been as plain a Contradiction, as to ſay, *That the Father is a Perſon, the Son a Perſon, and the Holy Ghoſt a Perſon, and yet there are not Three Perſons, but One Perſon:* Thus far our Author and I agree: But wherein then do we differ? For is it not expreſly ſaid in the Creed, that though the Father is Uncreated, the Son Uncreated, the Holy Ghoſt Uncreated, which are plainly Three Uncreated, if Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, are Three, yet there are not Three Uncreated, but One Uncreated? I Grant it; but if our Author had underſtood any *Greek* or *Latin*, he ſhould have made a little uſe of it here, and then he would have found, that the Creed of *Athanaſius* had not denied, that there were Three Uncreated Perſons, and therefore did not contradict, what it had before affirmed, that the Three Perſons of the Sacred Trinity are all Uncreated. For τρεῖς ἄκτιστοι, and *tres Increati*, cannot ſignifie Three Uncreated Perſons, as it muſt do to make it a Contradiction; for though there is no Subſtantive expreſſed,

fed, yet ſome muſt be underſtood, and ἄκτιστοι, and *Increati* will not agree with πρόσωπα, or *Perſonæ*, and therefore θεοὶ, and *Dii* muſt be underſtood; that is, though there are Three Uncreated Perſons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt; yet there are not Three Uncreated Gods, but One Uncreated God, which is no more a Contradiction, than to ſay, that though there are Three Divine Perſons, there are not Three, but One God.

And that this is the true meaning of the Article, appears from the whole ſcope and deſign of it. I ſhall inſtance only in the concluſion, which contains the Reaſon of the whole, why though all Three Perſons are Uncreated, Incomprehenſible, Eternal, Almighty, God, and Lord; yet we muſt not ſay, that there are Three, but One Eternal, Incomprehenſible, Uncreated, Almighty, God, and Lord: *For like as we are compelled by the Chriſtian Verity; to acknowledge every Perſon by himſelf to be God and Lord*, and there is the ſame Reaſon for Eternal, Uncreate, *&c. So are we forbidden by the Catholick Religion, to ſay, There are Three Gods, or Three Lords*, Three Eternals, Incomprehenſible, Uncreated, Almighties. Which plainly proves, that when the Creed denies, that there are Three Eternals, or Three Uncreated, it does not deny, that there are Three Eternal and Uncreated Perſons, but that there are Three Eternal and Uncreated Gods; which is not like ſaying, there are not Three Perſons, but One Perſon; but theſe Three Eternal Perſons are not Three Eternal Gods, but One Eternal God.

This is a ſufficient Anſwer with Relation to the Adjectives of Eternal, Uncreate, Incomprehenſible, Almighty, that if you joyn them with Perſon, there are

are Three Eternal, Uncreated Perſons, but if you join them with God, there are not Three Eternal, Uncreated Gods, but One Eternal, Uncreated God; and this is no more a Contradiction, than to ſay, there are Three Perſons and but One God; but what ſhall we ſay to the term GOD, which is aſcribed to all Three Perſons; and yet the Creed affirms, that though there are Three Perſons, each of which is God, yet there are not Three Gods, but One God? That is, *the term God is affirmed of Three, and yet denied to belong to more than One*; And is not this a Contradiction? I anſwer, No, unleſs this term God be attributed to Three divided and ſeparated Perſons; for if Three ſuch ſeparated Perſons be each of them God, they muſt be Three Gods, and it would be a Contradiction to ſay, that Three Perſons which are divided and ſeparated from each other, are each of them God, and yet that there are not Three Gods, but One God: But if theſe Three diſtinct Perſons are not ſeparated, but eſſentially united into One, each of them may be God, and all Three but One God: For if theſe Three Perſons, each of whom μοναδικῶς, as it is in the Creed, ſingly by himſelf, not ſeparately from the other Divine Perſons, is God and Lord, are eſſentially united into One, there can be but One God and One Lord, and how each of theſe Perſons is God, and all of them but One God, by their mutual Conſciouſneſs, I have already explained.

That *Salvo* he has found out for the *Trinitarians*, of this pretended Contradiction of Three Gods, and One God; that there are *Three perſonal Gods*, and but *One eſſential God*, is ſo ſenſeleſs, and the Paragraph ſo long, that I ſhall not give my ſelf the trouble of tranſcribing it: for the Anſwer lies in a few words.

We grant, there are Three Perſons, each of whom is God, but we deny, that there are *Three perſonal Gods*; becauſe though their Perſons are diſtinct, they never were, and never can be divided and ſeparated, and therefore can be but One God, being eſſentially united in One: By *Three Gods* all Mankind underſtand, Three diſtinct and ſeparate Beings, independent on One another, each of which is a Supreme and Sovereign God, as Three ſeparate humane Perſons are Three Men; but where the Perſons are not ſeparated, but eſſentially united into One, there we muſt acknowledge but One God.

But you'll ſay: Though the Union of their Perſons will not allow us to ſay, that there are Three ſeparate perſonal Gods, yet if all Three Perſons are diſtinct, though not ſeparated from each other, and each of them is God conſidered μεραδικῶς, as diſtinct, though not ſeparate from the other Divine Perſons, then at leaſt the Godhead of each Perſon muſt be as diſtinct as their Perſons are, and we muſt acknowledge three diſtinct, though not ſeparate Gods. I anſwer, by no means. We muſt allow each Perſon to be a God, but each diſtinct Perſon is not a diſtinct God; there is but One Godhead, which can no more be diſtinguiſhed, than it can be divided from it ſelf. There is but One God, and each Divine Perſon is this One numerical God, has the whole entire Godhead in himſelf, and the ſame One numerical Godhead is in them all; thus each Divine Perſon is God, and all of them but the ſame One God; as I explained it before.

This One Supreme God is Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, a Trinity in Unity, Three Perſons, and One God: Now Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, with all their

their Divine Attributes and Perfections (excepting their perſonal Properties, which the Schools call the *Modi ſubſiſtendi*, that One is the Father, the other the Son, the other the Holy Ghoſt, which cannot be communicated to each other) are whole and entire in each Perſon by a mutual conſciouſneſs, each Perſon feels the other Perſons in himſelf, all their eſſential Wiſdom, Power, Goodneſs, Juſtice, as he feels himſelf, and this makes them eſſentially One, as I have proved at large. Now if the whole Trinity be in each Divine Perſon by ſuch an intimate and eſſential Union, we muſt confeſs each Perſon to be God, if the whole Trinity be God, and yet there being but One Trinity, One Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, who are eſſentially One by a mutual Conſciouſneſs, it is certain all theſe Three Divine Perſons can be but One God: For where ever you begin to reckon, there are but Three, and theſe Three are One: If we conſider the Father and Holy Ghoſt in the Son by this mutual Conſciouſneſs, we truly affirm the Son to be God, as having all the Divine Perfections of the whole Trinity in himſelf; if we conſider the Father and the Son in the Holy Ghoſt, for the ſame reaſon we affirm the Holy Ghoſt to be God; but the natural Order of the Trinity is to reckon from the Father as the Fountain of the Deity, that Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt are One God; for the Son and Holy Spirit are in the Father, not only by a mutual Conſciouſneſs, as the Father and the Son are in the Holy Ghoſt, but as in their Cauſe, (if I may ſo ſpeak, and the Ancient Fathers were not afraid to ſpeak ſo) as in their Root, their Origin, their Fountain, from whence they receive the communications of the Divine Eſſence, and Godhead; the Son by Eternal Generation, being God of God, Light

of Light; the Holy Ghoſt by Eternal Proceſſion from the Father and the Son. Thus all theſe Divine Perſons are naturally united in the Father, who is the Fountain of the Deity, and all eſſentially in each other by a mutual Conſciouſneſs, which makes each Perſon God, and all One and the ſame God without any ſhew of Contradiction.

SECT. V.

The Doctrine of the Fathers, and of the Schools, concerning the Diſtinction of Perſons, and the Unity of Eſſence in the Ever Bleſſed Trinity, conſidered and reconciled to the foregoing Explication of it.

THis Notion of the Union of the Divine Perſons in One numerical Eſſence, by a mutual Conſciouſneſs to each other, is ſo very plain, and gives ſo eaſie and intelligible an account both of the Phraſes of Scripture, and all other Difficulties in the Doctrine of the Trinity, that this alone is ſufficient to reconcile any Man to it: But I am very ſenſible, how afraid Men are (and not without reaſon) of any new Explications of ſo Venerable a Myſtery, and ſuch a Fundamental Doctrine of Chriſtianity, as this is; and therefore I muſt ward this blow, as well as I can, and remove the prejudice of Novelty and Innovation. Now if it appear, that I have advanced no new Propoſition, but have confined my ſelf to the received Faith and Doctrine of the Catholick Church; if that Explication I have given of it, contain nothing new, but what is univerſally acknowledged, though poſſibly not in expreſs terms applied to that purpoſe I uſe it for; if that Explication I have given be very con-

conſiſtent with, nay, be the true interpretation of that account the Ancients give of a Trinity in Unity, I hope it will not be thought an unpardonable Novelty, if I have expreſſed the ſame thing in other words, which give us a more clear and diſtinct apprehenſion of it: And to ſatisfie all Men, that it is ſo, I ſhall compare, what I have now ſaid concerning the Diſtinction of Perſons, and the Unity of Eſſence in the Ever Bleſſed Trinity, with the Doctrine of the Fathers, and the Schools.

I. To begin then with the diſtinction of Perſons. I have not indeed troubled my Readers with the different ſignification of Eſſence, and Hypoſtaſis, Subſtance, Subſiſtence, Perſon, Exiſtence, Nature, *&c.* which are terms very differently uſed by *Greek* and *Latin* Fathers in this Diſpute, and have very much obſcured this Doctrine inſtead of explaining it; but I plainly aſſert, That as the Father is an eternal and infinite Mind, ſo the Son is an eternal and infinite Mind, diſtinct from the Father, and the Holy Ghoſt is an eternal and infinite Mind, diſtinct both from Father and Son; which every Body can underſtand without any skill in Logick or Metaphyſicks: And this is no new Notion, but the conſtant Doctrine both of the Fathers and Schools. Three Perſons ſignifie Three, who are infinite in Knowledge and Wiſdom, and all other Perfections, which belong to a Mind: Now no Man who acknowledges a Trinity of Perſons, ever denied that the Son and the Holy Spirit, were intelligent Beings or Minds.

When they tell us, (which is their common Language) that the Son is the ſubſtantial Word and Wiſdom of the Father, what is this elſe but to ſay, that

that he is an intelligent Being, or infinite Mind: *Greg. Nyſſen* calls the Son, or Word, νοεερὸν τι χρῆμα, Mind, or Intellect. *Athanaſius* obſerves from our Saviour's words, *I and my Father are One*; that *are* ſignifies Two, or the diſtinction of Perſons, as *One* ſignifies the Unity of Eſſence: for he does not ſay, I and my Father *am*, but are *One*. And therefore if the Father be an eternal Mind and Wiſdom, the Son alſo is an eternal, but begotten Mind and Wiſdom; as the *Nicene* Creed tells us, That he is God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God. St. *Auſtin* in his Sixth Book of the Trinity, takes notice of a common Argument uſed by the Orthodox Fathers againſt the *Arians*, to prove the coeternity of the Son with the Father, That if the Son be the Wiſdom and Power of God, as St. *Paul* teaches, 1 *Cor.* 1. and God was never without his Wiſdom and Power, the Son muſt be coeternal with the Father; for it is diſtraction to ſay, that the Father was ever without his Wiſdom, or Power, was neither Wiſe nor Powerful. But this acute Father diſcovered a great inconvenience in this Argument, for it forces us to ſay, that the Father is not Wiſe, but by that Wiſdom which he begot, not being himſelf Wiſdom as the Father: And then we muſt conſider, whether the Son himſelf, as he is God of God, and Light of Light, may be ſaid to be Wiſdom of Wiſdom,

Ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, ἐγὼ καὶ Πατὴρ ἓν ἐσμὲν ἀλλὰ εἶπεν ἓν ἐσμεν, καὶ τὸ δυάδα τελείαν παρέστησεν ἐν τῷ λέξαι ἓν ἐσμεν τὸ δὲ ἓν, τὸ τῆ οὐσίας ἐσήμανε. Athanaſ. Cont. Arium Diſput. Tom 1. p. 116. *Paris* 1627.

Quæ ratiocinatio ad id cogit, ut dicamus Deum Patrem non eſſe ſapientem, niſi habendo ſapientiam quam genuit, non exiſtendo per ſe pater ſapientia. Deinde ſi ita eſt, filius quoque ipſe ſicut dicitur Deus de Deo lumen de lumine, videndum eſt utrum poſſit ſapientia de ſapientia dici, ſi non eſt Deus Pater ipſa ſapientia, ſed tantum Genitor ſapientiæ. Quod ſi tenemus, cur non & magnitudinis ſuæ, & bonitatis, & æternitatis, & omnipotentiæ ſuæ Generator ſit; ut non ipſe ſit ſua magnitudo, & ſua bonitas, & ſua æternitas, & ſua omnipotentia, ſed eâ magnitudine magnus ſit, quam genuit, & ea bonitate bonus, &c. S. Aug. Tom. 3. l. 6. de Trinitate.

dom, if God the Father be not Wiſdom, but only begets Wiſdom; and by the ſame reaſon we may ſay, that he begets his own Greatneſs, and Goodneſs, and Eternity, and Omnipotency, and is not himſelf his own Greatneſs, or Goodneſs, or Eternity, or Omnipotency, but is Great, and Good, Eternal and Omnipotent, by the Greatneſs, Goodneſs, Eternity, Omnipotency, which is born of him; as he is not his own Wiſdom, but is wiſe with that Wiſdom, which he begets.

The Maſter of the Sentences follows St. *Auſtin* exactly in this Point, and urges this unanſwerable Argument for it, which he grounds upon St. *Auſtin*'s Principle, That in God, to be, and to be Wiſe is the ſame thing, and if it be, he cannot be Wiſe with the Wiſdom he begets, for then he would receive his Being from this begotten Wiſdom, not Wiſdom from him: For if the Wiſdom he begets be the Cauſe of his being Wiſe, it is the Cauſe alſo, that he is; which muſt be either by begetting or by making him; but no Man will ſay, that Wiſdom is any way the Begetter or Maker of the Father? which is the heighth of madneſs. And in the next Chapter he teaches, That the Father is unbegotten, the Son begotten Wiſdom; ſo that according to St. *Auſtin* and the Maſter of the Sentences, who is the Oracle of the Schools, the Father is Eternal Wiſdom, or an Eternal Mind, and the Son Eternal Wiſdom and Mind, though both are united into One Eternal Wiſdom: And if we confeſs this of Father and Son, there can be no Diſpute about the Holy

Si hoc eſt ibi eſſe quod Sapere, non per illam Sapientiam quam genuit, Sapiens dicitur Pater, alioquin non ipſa ab illo, ſed ille ab ipſa eſt. Si enim Sapientia quam genuit, Cauſa eſt illi ut Sapiens ſit, etiam ut ſit, ipſa illi Cauſa eſt, quod fieri non poteſt niſi gignendo eum, aut faciendo, ſed nec genetricem nec conditricem Patris ullo modo quiſquam dixerit Sapientiam; quid enim eſt inſanius. Lib. 1. Diſt. 32. cap. Præterea.

ly Ghoſt, who is Eternal Mind and Wiſdom, diſtinct, both from Father and Son.

Nothing is more familiar with the ancient Fathers, than to repreſent Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, to be Three as diſtinct Perſons, as *Peter*, *James*, and *John* are, as every one knows, who is at all verſed in this Controverſie; and this is charged on them by ſome Men, as little better than Polytheiſm, or a Trinity of Gods, as *Peter*, *James*, and *John* are a Trinity of Men; but this muſt be true with reference to diſtinction of Perſons, if we will acknowledge a real diſtinction between them; for if the diſtinction be real, and not meerly nominal (which was the Hereſie of *Sabellius*) their Perſons muſt be as diſtinct, as three human Perſons, or three Men are: The Father is no more the Son, or the Holy Ghoſt, than *Peter* is *James* or *John:* But then they are not ſeparated or divided from each other, as *Peter*, *James* and *John* are; for that indeed would make them three Gods, as *Peter*, *James* and *John* are three Men.

There is no Example in Nature of ſuch a diſtinction and unity, as is between the Three Perſons in the Godhead, and therefore the ancient Fathers made uſe of ſeveral Compariſons to different purpoſes, which muſt carefully be confined to what they applied them, for if we extend them farther, we make Nonſenſe or Hereſie of them. There are three things to be conſidered in the ever bleſſed Trinity; the diſtinction of Perſons, the ὁμοουσιότης or Sameneſs of Nature, and their eſſential Unity; and the Fathers make uſe of different Compariſons to repreſent each of theſe by, becauſe no One can repreſent them all; but inconſidering Perſons ſeek for all in One, and becauſe they cannot find it, they reject them all, as impertinent, dan-

dangerous, or heretical, and reproach the Fathers, ſometimes as ignorant of this great Myſtery, ſometimes as bordering upon Hereſie, which I am ſure does little ſervice to the Doctrine it ſelf, and gives great countenance to falſe and corrupt Notions of it; when the Fathers themſelves, even thoſe who were the moſt zealous Oppoſers of Arianiſm, are thought Favourers of ſuch Opinions. I ſhall have occaſion to take notice of ſeveral Inſtances of this, as I go on, at preſent I ſhall confine my ſelf to the Diſtinction of Perſons which cannot be more truly and aptly repreſented than by the diſtinction between three men; for Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt are as really diſtinct Perſons, as *Peter*, *James* and *John*; but whoever ſhall hence conclude, That theſe Fathers thought, that Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt are no otherwiſe One alſo, than *Peter*, *James* and *John* are, greatly abuſe them without any colourable pretence for it, as will appear more preſently; but this Compariſon of theirs ſhows what their ſenſe was, that theſe Three Divine Perſons are Three Eternal and Infinite Minds, as really diſtinct from each other, as Three Men are; though eſſentially united into One Infinite and Eternal Mind, or One God. But I need not inſiſt on this, for the real diſtinction of Perſons is ſo plainly taught by the ancient Fathers, eſpecially after the riſe of the *Sabellian* Hereſie, that there is more difficulty to underſtand, how they unite them into One God, than that they make them diſtinct Perſons, and what they ſay about the Unity of the Godhead, abundantly proves this diſtinction of Perſons.

Secondly, Let us therefore in the ſecond place conſider, how they explain this great Myſtery of a

Trinity in Unity; they all agree, that there are Three distinct Persons, and that these Three Persons are but One God; and they seem to me to agree very well in that account they give of it; though some late Writers are very free, and I think very unjust, in their Censures of some of them as scarcely Orthodox in this Point: I shall only remind you, that this being so great a Mystery, of which we have no Example in Nature, it is no wonder, if it cannot be explained by any one kind of Natural Union; and therefore it was necessary to use several Examples, and to allude to several kinds of Union, to form an adequate Notion of the Unity of the Godhead, and we must carefully apply what they say to those Ends and Purposes for which they said it, and not extend it beyond their Intention, as I observed before; and there are several Steps they take towards the Explication of this great Mystery, which I shall represent in short, and show, that taking them altogether, they give a plain and intelligible Notion of this Unity in Trinity, and indeed no other than what I have already given of it.

1. The first thing then to be considered is the ὁμοουσιότης or Co-essentiality of the Divine Persons. That all Three Persons in the Godhead have the same Nature, which they signified by the word ὁμοούσιος: now whereas the same Nature may signifie the same Numerical, or the same Specifick Nature, *Petavius*, and after him Dr. *Cudworth*, have abundantly proved, that the *Nicene* Fathers did not understand this word of a Numerical, but Specifick Sameness of Nature: or the agreement of things, numerically differing from one another in the same common Nature. As

Petavius de Trin. l. 4. c. 5. *Cudworth's Intellectual System*, p. 603. &c.

Maximus

Maximus very plainly tells us, that that is ſaid to be ὁμοούσιον, which has the ſame Notion or Definition of its Eſſence, as a Man differs nothing from a Man, as he is a Man, nor an Angel from an Angel, as he is an Angel: And therefore this Word did equally overthrow the *Sabellian* and the *Arian* Hereſie; as it affirms both a Diſtinction of Perſons, and the Sameneſs of Nature, as St. *Ambroſe* and others obſerve; for nothing is ὁμοούσιον to itſelf, but to ſomething elſe, diſtinct from it ſelf, but of the ſame common Nature: and therefore ſome, who owned the ὁμοούσιον, rejected the μονοούσιον and συνούσιον and ταυτ᾽ούσιον as ſavouring of *Sabellianiſm*, and implying ſuch a Numerical Unity of Eſſence in the Godhead, as deſtroyed all diſtinction of Perſons; for which reaſon the ὁμοούσιον it ſelf was rejected by ſome, as abuſed by the *Sabellians*, till the ſignification of that word was fixt and declared by the Fathers at *Nice*, as *Petavius* obſerves.

Ὁμοούσιον ἐστὶν, ὁ τὸν αὐτὸν ἐπιδέχεται λόγον τῆς οὐσίας· οἷον, ἄνθρωπος ἀνθρώπου οὐδὲν διαφέρει, καθὸ ἄνθρωπος ἐστὶν. Ἄγγελος Ἀγγέλου οὐδὲν διαφέρει ᾗ Ἄγγελος ἐστὶν. οὕτω καὶ Θεὸς Θεοῦ οὐδὲν διαφέρει, ᾗ Θεὸς ἐστίν. Maximi Dial. 1. de Trinit. inter Opera Athanaſii. Vol. 2. p. 168. Edit. *Paris.*

Ambroſ. l. 3 de Fide, c. 7.

This is One thing wherein the Fathers place the Unity of the Godhead; that all Three Perſons have the ſame Nature; and to be ſure this is abſolutely neceſſary to make Three Perſons One God; for it is impoſſible they ſhould be One God, if they have not the ſame Nature, unleſs Three diſtinct and ſeparate Beings of divers Natures can be One God; that is, unleſs the Divine Nature be not One pure and ſimple Act, but a compound Being, and that of different Natures too. But ſome of the Fathers went farther than this, and placed the Eſſential Unity of the Divine Nature in the Sameneſs of Eſſence; that there is but One God, becauſe all the Three Divine Perſons have the ſame Nature. And it will be ne-

ceſſary briefly to examine what they meant by it, to vindicate theſe Fathers from the Miſ-repreſentations, and hard Cenſures of *Petavius* and Dr. *Cudworth*, who (as I hope to make appear) have greatly miſtaken their Senſe. The Charge is, that they make the Three Divine Perſons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, to be One God only upon account of the ſame Specifical Divine Nature common to them all; juſt as Three men are One, by having the ſame common Nature, or the ſame Humanity: and being asked, why they may not then be called Three Gods, as well as we ſay, *Peter*, *James*, and *John*, are Three Men; they anſwer, That this is owing to an ill Cuſtom, for they ought not to be called Three men neither, which is like ſaying, there are Three Human Natures; and though in inferiour Matters we may bear with the abuſe of Words, and improper Forms of Speech, yet this is of dangerous Conſequence, when we ſpeak of God; and therefore though there is no great hurt in ſaying, there are Three Men, though there is but one Humanity common to them all; yet we muſt not ſay there are three Gods, ſince there is but one Divine Nature and Eſſence common to all Three Perſons: This, *Petavius* ſays, is to deny the true and real Unity of the Divine Subſtance and Eſſence, and to make God only collectively One; as a multitude of men are ſaid to be One People, and a multitude of Believers One Church; which was the Error of Abbot *Joachim*, for which he was Condemned in the Council of *Lateran.* Dr. *Cudworth* repreſents it thus: *Theſe Theologers ſuppoſed the Three Perſons of their Trinity to have really no other than a Specifick Unity and Identity, and becauſe it ſeems plainly to follow from hence, that therefore*

Petav. de Trin. l. 4. c. 9.

Ubi ſupra.

fore they muſt needs be as much Three Gods, as Three men are Three men, theſe Learned Fathers endeavoured with their Logick to prove, that Three men are but abuſively and improperly ſo called Three, they being really and truly but One, becauſe there is but One and the ſame Specifick Eſſence or Subſtance of Human Nature in them all. ——— He adds, *It ſeems plain that this Trinity is no other than a kind of Tritheiſm, and that of Gods Independent and Co-ordinate too.*

This is a very high Charge, and yet theſe *Theologers* are no leſs men than *Gregory Nyſſen*, and *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, and *Maximus*, and *Damaſcen*, men of Note in their Generation, and never charged with Hereſie before. But whatever the meaning of theſe Fathers was, it is plain, that *Petavius* and Dr. *Cudworth* have miſtaken their meaning. For they did not think, that Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt were One God, only as *Peter*, *James*, and *John*, are one man; or that *Peter*, *James*, and *John*, are One man, as Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt are One God; they neither dreamt of a Collective nor Specifick Unity of the Godhead, but aſſerted a real ſubſiſting numerical Unity of Eſſence, as is obvious to every impartial Reader, and therefore if they had not underſtood, how they explained this, yet they ought not to have put ſuch a ſenſe upon their Words, as is directly contrary to what they affirm: I ſhall not need to tranſcribe much out of theſe Fathers to juſtifie them in this Point, but will only repreſent their Argument as plainly as I can, and that will be their Juſtification, whatever become of their Argument.

They affirm then, That Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, are but One God, becauſe there is, and can be,

be, but One numerical Divinity, or one Divine Nature and Eſſence, though it ſubſiſt in Three diſtinct Perſons: Againſt this it was objected, that *Peter James*, and *John*, though they have the ſame Human Nature, yet are called Three Men; and there is no abſurdity in it, when there are more than One, who have the ſame Nature, to ſpeak of them in the Plural Number, to call Two Two, and Three Three; how then comes it to paſs, that Religion forbids this, that when we acknowledge Three Perſons, who have the ſame Nature without any imaginable difference, we muſt in a manner contradict our ſelves, confeſſing the Divinity of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt to be One and the ſame, and denying that they are Three Gods.

Καὶ εἰ οὐδὲν ἄτοπον τοὺς συνημμένους κατὰ φύσιν, εἰ πλείους εἶεν ἐκ τῆς τῆς φύσεως ὀνόματος πληθυντικῶς ἀριθμεῖσθαι εἰ οὖν ἐκεῖ τοῦτο δίδωσιν ἡ συνηθεία, καὶ ὁ ἀπαγορεύων οὐκ ἐστὶ, δύο λέγειν τοὺς δύο, καὶ τρεῖς τοὺς ὑπὲρ δύο, πῶς ἐστὶ τῶν μυστικῶν δογμάτων τὰς τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις ὁμολογοῦντες, καὶ οὐδεμίαν ἐπ' αὐτῶν τῆς κατὰ φύσιν, διαφορὰν ἐννοοῦντες, μαχόμεθα τρόπόν τινα τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ, μίαν μὲν τῆς θεοτήτα τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος λέγοντες, τρεῖς δὲ Θεοὺς λέγειν ἀπαγορεύοντες. Greg. Nyſſ. Tom 2.p.448. *Quod non ſint tres Dii.*

This *Gregory Nyſſen* anſwers at large, and I ſhall chiefly confine my ſelf to the Anſwers he gives, which will abundantly ſhow, how much theſe two learned Men have miſ-repreſented his Senſe.

And firſt, he takes notice of the common Form of Speech, of calling Three, who partake of the ſame Human Nature, Three Men, which inclines us to call the Three Divine Perſons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, who have all the ſame Divine Nature, Three Gods, and that naturally betrays Men into the Opinion of a Trinity of Gods, as well as of a Trinity of Perſons, who are as much Three Gods, as *Peter*, *James*, and *John*, are Three Men: And therefore he tells us, that this is an improper way of ſpeaking, even

even when applied to men, to ſay, that there are Three men. For man is the name of Nature, not of the Perſon; to ſay that there is but One man, is no more than to ſay, there is but One Humanity, and to ſay there are Three men, is to ſay, there are Three Humanities, or Three Human Natures; and the Name of Nature cannot be a proper Name of diſtinction, and therefore ought not to be multiplied; for that which is the ſame in all, cannot diſtinguiſh one Perſon from another. This he obſerves all men are very ſenſible of; for when they would call any particular Perſon out of a Crowd, they do not call him by the name of Nature, that is, they do not ſay, you *man* come hither; for this being a common Name, as the Nature is common, no man could tell, who was meant; but they call him by the Name of his Perſon, *Peter*, or *James*; for though there are many, who partake of the ſame Human Nature, yet there is but One man, or One Humanity in them all: Perſons are diſtinguiſhed and divided and multiplied by peculiar perſonal properties, and therefore may be numbered; but Nature is One, united with it ſelf, a perfect indiviſible Unity, which neither increaſes by Addition, nor is diminiſhed by Subſtraction, but though it be in a Multitude of Individuals, is whole, entire, and undivided, in all. And therefore as a People, an Army, a Church, are named in the ſingle number, though they conſiſt of Multitudes, ſo in exactneſs and propriety of Speech, man may be ſaid to be One, though there are a Multitude who partake of the ſame Humane Nature. So that, hitherto all that the Father hath ſaid, tends only to juſtifie this Form of Speech, as having nothing abſurd or incongruous in it, to acknowledge, that the Fa-

Father is God, the Son God, and the Holy Ghoſt God, and yet that there is but One Divinity or Godhead, not Three Gods, for though this ſounds as harſh, as to own, that *Peter* is a man, and *James* a man, and *John* a man, and yet there are not Three men, but One man, which cuſtom has made very abſurd and contradictious to ſay, (which is the Objection he was to anſwer) yet he obſerves, that according to ſtrict propriety of ſpeaking, this is no abſurdity to ſay, there are not Three men, but One man; nay, that it is an abuſe of Speech to ſay otherwiſe, becauſe *man* is the name of Nature, not of a Perſon, and therefore there is but One man, as there is but One Human Nature in all thoſe, who partake of it, for Human Nature is but One, whole, and indiviſible in all; and therefore cannot diſtinguiſh One Perſon from another, and therefore not be a Name of Number.

But what makes St. *Gregory* diſpute thus nicely about the uſe of words, and oppoſe the common and ordinary Forms of Speech? Did he in good earneſt believe, that there is but One man in the World? No! No! he acknowledged as many men, as we do; a great Multitude who had the ſame Human Nature, and that every one who had a Human Nature, was an individual man diſtinguiſhed and divided from all other Individuals of the ſame Nature; what makes him ſo zealous then againſt ſaying, that *Peter*, *James*, and *John*, are three men? only this; that he ſays *Man* is the Name of Nature, and therefore to ſay there are Three men is the ſame as to ſay, there are Three Human Natures, of a different kind; for if there are Three Human Natures, they muſt differ from each other, or they can't be Three; and ſo you deny, *Peter*, *James*, and *John*, to be ὁμοούσιοι, or of the ſame

ſame Nature; and for the ſame reaſon, we muſt ſay, that though the Father be God, the Son God, and the Holy Ghoſt God, yet there are not Three Gods, but *μία Θεότης*, One Godhead and Divinity, leſt we deſtroy their Homoouſiotes, or the Sameneſs of their Nature, and introduce Three Gods of a different Nature, like the Pagan *Polytheiſm*: which is the firſt reaſon he gives, why we do not ſay there are Three Gods to avoid the ſuſpicion of *Polytheiſm*, in numbring and multiplying Gods, as the Heathens did, which he ſays is a ſufficient Anſwer for ignorant and unskilful People. But to ſay this in groſs, will not ſatisfie more inquiſitive Men, and therefore he aſſigns this reaſon for it, that Individuals in ſtrict propriety of Speech ought not to be numbred by the Name of their Nature, becauſe that argues a diverſity in their Natures; to ſay Three Men, is to ſay, there are Three different Humanities, whereas Humanity is One and the ſame in all; and as Men are not diſtinguiſhed, ſo they ought not to be numbred by the Name of Nature; and that this is all his meaning, appears from the reaſon he gives, why this improper way of ſpeaking may be tolerated without any inconvenience, when we ſpeak of Men, that we may ſay, there are Three Men, but it is very dangerous to apply this to the Divinity, and ſay there are Three Gods; becauſe there is no danger, by this Form of Speech, that there are Three or more

Ἐστὶ μὲν οὖν κατὰ πρόχειρον τοῦτο τοῖς ἁπλουστέροις εἰπόντα δόξαι τὶ λέγειν, ὅτι φεύγων ὁ λόγος Ἑλληνικῆς πολυθείας τὴν ὁμοιότητα, Θεοὺς ἐν πλήθει ἀριθμεῖν παρητήσατο, ὡς ἂν μή τις τῶν δογμάτων νομισθείη κοινότης, εἰ μὴ μοναδικῶς ἀλλὰ πληθυντικῶς καὶ παρ' ἡμῖν ἀριθμεῖτο τὸ θεῖον. Ibid. p. 448.

Διὰ τοῦτο ἀνθρώπους συγχώρει πληθυντικῶς ὀνομάζειν, διὰ τὸ μηδένα τῷ τοιούτῳ σχήματι τῆς φωνῆς εἰς πλῆθος ἀνθρωποτήτων τῶν ὑπονοίαις ἐκπίπτειν, μηδὲ νομίζειν πολλὰς ἀνθρωπίνας φύσεις σημαίνεσθαι, διὰ τὸ πληθυντικῶς ἐξαγγελθῆναι τὸ τῆς φύσεως ὄνομα· τὸ δὲ Θεὸς φονὴν παρατετηρημένους κατὰ τὴν ἑνικὸν ἐξαγγέλλει τύπον, τοῦτο προμηθουμένη, τὸ μὴ διαφόρους φύσεις ἐπὶ τῆς θείας οὐσίας ἐν τῇ πληθυντικῇ σημασίᾳ τῶν Θεῶν παρεισάγεσθαι. Ibid. p. 458.

Men, that any one ſhould be betrayed into that Conceit, that we mean a Multitude of Humanities, or many different Humane Natures; but there is danger, leſt our naming more Gods, or ſaying, that there are Three Gods, Men ſhould imagine, that there are divers and different Natures in the Divinity; that is, that the Three Perſons in the Godhead are not all of the ſame Nature.

Here St. *Gregory* lays his Foundation, That we muſt not ſay, there are Three Gods, becauſe there is but One Divinity; Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, being all ὁμοούσιοι, of the ſame Nature, whereas *God* being the Name of Nature, to ſay there are Three Gods, is to ſay, there are Three different Divinities, or Divine Natures, which deſtroys the Homoouſiotes of the Godhead; which is the Summ of his Argument againſt uſing the Name of Nature plurally, to ſay, there are Three Men, or Three Gods.

Athanaſii Vol. 1. Dial. 1. de Trin.

There is nothing more plain than this in the Dialogues of *Maximus*, who all along explains this μία θεότης and μία ἀνθρωπότης, the One Divinity and the One Humanity, by the τὸ ὁμοούσιον, or the Sameneſs of Nature, and therefore there can be but One Nature, though it ſubſiſt in ſeveral Perſons, or Individuals.

Now indeed had they gone no farther in explaining the Unity of the Godhead, than this Specifick Unity and Identity of Nature, there had been ſome reaſon to quarrel with them; but they do not ſtop here, but proceed to ſhow, how this ὁμοούσιον or Sameneſs of Nature in all Three Perſons of the ever bleſſed Trinity, proves a true Numerical and Eſſential Unity of the Godhead; which it does not, and cannot do in created Natures: without this it is evident,

dent, there can be no Eſſential Unity, unleſs we will allow of a Compoſition of different Natures in the Godhead; where the Nature is the ſame it may be One, not only by a Logical, but by a Real and Eſſential Unity.

Gregory Nyſſen has two ways of doing this. 1. He obſerves, that the Name *God*, and ſo thoſe other Names which are aſcribed to the Divinity, do not ſo properly ſignifie the Divine Nature, as declare ſomething relating to it: For the Divine Nature is ἀκατονόμαστον καὶ ἄφραστον, that which has no Name, and which no words can expreſs and ſignifie, as the Scripture teaches, but the Names given to God only teach us, either what we ought not to attribute to the Divine Nature, or what we ought, but not what the Divine Nature it ſelf is.

Ὡς ἐκ τούτου δείκνυσθαι μὴ αὐτῷ τῇ θείᾳ φύσιν τινὸς τῶν ὀνομάτων σεσημειῶσθαι, ἀλλά πῃ τῶν περὶ αὐτῷ διὰ τῶν λεγομένων γνωρίζεσθαι. Καὶ τὰ ἄλλα πάντα κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον ἐκ τῆς ἐγκειμένης τῇ θεοπρεπεστέραις φωναῖς σημασίας ἐυρίσκομεν, ἢ τὸ μὴ δεῖον ὅτι τῇ θείᾳ φύσεως γνώσκει ἀπορρίπτοντα, ἢ τὸ δέον διδάσκοντα, αὐτῆς δὲ τῆς φύσεως ἑρμήνειαν οὐ παρέχοντα. Greg. Nyſſ. Vol. 2. p. 451.

This is a fair Introduction, ſuch as becomes a wiſe Man, who conſiders, how unknown the Eſſences of all Things are to us, much more the Subſtance and Eſſence of God, and how it confounds our Minds, when we talk of the Numerical Unity of the Godhead, to have the leaſt conception or thought about the diſtinction and union of the Natures and Eſſences; and therefore he tells us, that Θεὸς is θεατὴς and ἔφορος, the Inſpector and Governour of the World; that is, it is a Name of Energy, Operation, and Power; and if this Vertue, Energy, Operation be the very ſame in all the Perſons of the Trinity, Fa-

ther, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, then they are but One God, but One Power and Energy; and thus he proves it is, and that not as it is among, Men, who have the ſame Power and Skill, do the very ſame Things, profeſs the ſame Art, are Philoſophers or Orators alike; and yet are not all One Philoſopher, or One Orator; becauſe though they do the ſame thing, yet they act apart, every one by himſelf, and have no Communion nor ſhare in what each other do; but their Operations are proper to themſelves alone; but in the Divine Nature it is not ſo, the Father does nothing by himſelf, nor the Son by himſelf, nor the Holy Ghoſt by himſelf; but the whole Energy and Operation of the Deity relating to Creatures, begins with the Father, paſſes to the Son, and from Father and Son to the Holy Spirit: The Holy Trinity does not act any thing ſeparately, there are not Three diſtinct Operations, as there are Three Perſons, ἀλλὰ μία τις γίνεται ἀγαθοῦ βουλήματος κίνησις καὶ διακόσμησις, but one motion and diſpoſition of the good Will, which paſſes through the whole Trinity from Father to Son, and to the Holy Ghoſt; and this is done ἀχρόνως καὶ ἀδιαστάτως without any diſtance of Time, or propagating the Motion from one to t'other, but by One thought, as it is in One numerical Mind and Spirit, and therefore though they are Three Perſons, they are but one numerical Power and Energy.

"Ὅτι ἄνθρωποι μέν, κἂν μιᾶς ὦσιν ἐνεργείας οἱ πλείονες, καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἕκαστος ἀποτετμημένῳ ἐνεργεῖ τὸ προκείμενον, οὐδὲν ἐπικοινωνῶν ἐν τῇ καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἐνεργείᾳ πρὸς τὸν τὸ αὐτὸν πράττοντας —— ἰδίως ῥητορεύων ὁ δεῖνα, καὶ ἰδίως ὁ ἕτερος· κἂν ἐν μέν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἐπειδὴ διακεχριμένη ἡ ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς πράγμασιν ἑκάστου ἐνέργεια, πολλοὶ ὀνομάζονται. —— Ibid. p. 453.

Ibid. p. 456, 457.

By this time I hope the Reader is ſatisfied, That this Father does not make the Perſons of the Trinity Three

Three Independent and Coordinate Gods, who are no otherwiſe One than Three Men are by a Specifick Unity and Identity of Nature, but has found out ſuch an Unity for them, as he confeſſes cannot be between Three Men, even ſuch an Unity as there is in a Spirit, which is numerically One with it ſelf, and conſcious to all its own Motions; for I leave any Man to judge, whether this μία κίνησις βουλήματος, this one ſingle Motion of Will which is in the ſame inſtant in Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, can ſignifie any thing elſe but a mutual conſciouſneſs, which makes them numerically One, and as intimate to each other, as every Man is to himſelf, as I have already explained it. *Petavius* was aware of this, and therefore will not allow this to belong to the ſame Argument, but to be a new and diſtinct Argument by it ſelf: Now ſuppoſe this, yet methinks he ſhould have ſuſpected, he had miſtaken the Fathers Senſe, when he found him contradict, what he apprehended to be his Senſe, within the compaſs of two Pages; but indeed the Miſtake is his own, for the Father purſues his intended Argument to prove, that though the Father is God, and the Son God, and the Holy Ghoſt God, yet we ought not to ſay, that there are Three Gods, but One God. This he proves firſt, becauſe God is the Name of Nature, and the Name of Nature muſt not be expreſſed in the Plural Number, when the Nature is the ſame without any the leaſt conceivable difference; for to ſay, there are Three Gods, is to ſay, that there are Three different Divine Natures, which introduces *Polytheiſm*, as to ſay there are Three Men, is to ſay, there are Three different Humane Natures; for if they be the ſame, they are not Three; and therefore the Name of the Na-

Nature must not be expressed plurally, how many Persons soever there are, who have the same Nature. This was to secure the Homoousiotes of the Divine Nature, and if he had stopped here, *Petavius* and Dr. *Cudworth* might have said what they pleased of him; but having secured the Homoousiotes or Sameness of Nature, which was the great dispute of those days between the Orthodox and the *Arians*, he proceeds to show, how this same Nature in Three distinct Persons is united into One numerical Essence and Godhead; and this he does first by showing, that God signifies Power and Energy, and that all the Three Persons in the Trinity have but One numerical Energy and Operation, and therefore are but One God; which is only the improvement of his former Argument; for the Sameness of Nature is necessary to the Sameness of Operation; for Nature is the Principle of Action, especially in God, whose Nature is a pure and simple Act, and an unity and singularity of Energy and Operation is a demonstration of One numerical Essence; for the same single individual Act cannot be done by Two separate Beings, who must act separately also.

Secondly, As for those, who are not contented to contemplate God as a pure and simple Act or Energy, which easily solves this difficulty, how Three Persons are One God, they having but One numerical Energy and Operation; I say, as for those who not contented with this, inquire after the Unity of the Divine Nature and Essence, he asserts that this perfect Homoousiotes or Sameness of Nature, without the least difference or alteration makes them numerically One; and returns to what he had first said,

said, That the Name of Nature should not be expressed Plurally, it being One entire undivided Unity, which is neither encreased nor diminished by subsisting in more or fewer Persons,

I confess, I do not understand his reasoning in this matter, he seems to destroy all Principles of Individuation, whereby One thing is distinguished from another, where there is no difference or diversity of Nature; for Things, he says, must be distinguished by Magnitude, Place, Figure, Colour, or some other diversity in Nature, before we can number them, and call them Two or Three: and therefore since the Divine simple unalterable Nature, admits of no Essential diversity, that it may be One, it will not admit of any number in it self, but is but One God. Whereas I confess to my understanding, if the same pure unmixt Nature, as suppose Humanity, should subsist in Twenty several Persons, without the least variation, I should not doubt, notwithstanding the Specifick Unity of Nature, to say, there are Twenty subsisting Humane Natures; and Three Minds and Spirits, which have no other difference, are yet distinguished by self-consciousness, and are Three distinct Spirits: And therefore to help this out, he sometimes adds, that there is μήτε φύσεως μήτε ἐνεργείας τινὰ διαφορὰν ἐν θεότητι, no difference either of Nature or Energy in the Deity; and at other times, ἡ Θεία φύσις ἀπαράλλακτος καὶ ἀδιαίρετος, the Divine Nature is invariable, and undivided; which all the ancient Fathers added to explain the Unity of the Trinity, that inseparate Union of Nature, which is between the Divine Persons, that they are ἀχώριστοι, inseparable from each other.

Ἐπεὶ ὃ πᾶς ἀπωθεῖ ὅρος κατ' οὐσίαν ἑτερότητα ἡ θεία τε καὶ ἁπλῆ καὶ ἀναλλοίωτος φύσις, ὡς ἂν μία ᾖ, πολυθεΐας σημασίαν ἐφ' ἑαυτῆς οὐ σχοίη. Greg. Nyss. ibid. p. 456.

But

But however he might be miſtaken in his Philoſophy, he was not in his Divinity: for he aſſerts a numerical Unity of the Divine Nature, not a meer Specifick Unity, which is nothing but a Logical Notion, nor a Collective Unity, which is nothing but a Company, who are Naturally many; but a true ſubſiſting numerical Unity of Nature; and if the difficulty of explaining this, and his zeal to defend it, forced him upon ſome unintelligible Nicities, to prove that the ſame numerical Humane Nature too is but one in all Men, it is hard to charge him with teaching, that there are Three Independent and Coordinate Gods, becauſe we think he has not proved, that *Peter*, *James*, and *John*, are but one Man. This will make very foul work with the Fathers, if we charge them with all thoſe Erronious Conceits about the Trinity, which we can fancy in their inconvenient ways of explaining that venerable Myſtery, eſpecially when they compare that myſterious Unity with any Natural Unions.

I am ſure St. *Gregory* was ſo far from ſuſpecting that he ſhould be charged with Tritheiſm upon this Account, that he fences againſt another Charge of mixing and confounding the Hypoſtaſes or Perſons, by denying any difference or diverſity of Nature, ὡς ἐκ τοῦ μὴ διχεῖσθαι τὴν κατ' φύσιν διαφορὰν, μίξιν τινα τῶν ὑποστάσεων καὶ ἀνακύκλησιν κατασκευάζοντα, which argues, that he thought he had ſo fully aſſerted the Unity of the Divine Eſſence, that ſome might ſuſpect, he had left but One Perſon, as well as One Nature, in God. Ibid. p. 459.

But though the Homoouſiotes or Coeſſentiality of the Divine Perſons is not ſufficient alone to prove this Unity of the Godhead, yet as I before obſerved, this

this is neceſſary to an eſſential Unity, for they muſt all have the ſame Nature, or they cannot be One, and therefore this was the firſt thing to be conſidered in the Unity of the Godhead.

Secondly, To this *Homo-ouſiotes* the Fathers added a numerical Unity of the Divine Eſſence. This *Petavius* has proved at large by numerous Teſtimonies, even from thoſe very Fathers, whom he before accuſed for making God only collectively One, as Three Men are One Man; ſuch as *Gregory Nyſſen*, St. *Cyril*, *Maximus*, *Damaſcen*; which is a demonſtration, that however he might miſtake their explication of it, from the Unity of human Nature, they were far enough from *Tritheiſm*, or One collective God. *Petavii* Vol. 2. l. 4. c. 13, 14.

For we muſt obſerve, though all the Fathers aſſert, the ſingularity of the Godhead, or the numerical Unity of the Divine Eſſence, yet they do not aſſert ſuch a numerical Unity, as there is, where there is but One Perſon as well as One Eſſence; but ſuch a numerical Unity, as there is between Three, who are ὁμοούσιοι, of the very ſame nature, but are not meerly united by a ſpecifick Unity, but by an eſſential Union, and therefore are Three and One. This as *Maximus* truly ſays, is ἀσύγχυτος καὶ ἡ διαίρεσις καὶ ἡ ἕνωσις, both a wonderful diſtinction and union, but though ſeveral Fathers attempt ſeveral ways of explaining it, they all agree in the thing; that Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, Three diſtinct Divine Perſons, are united in one numerical Nature and Eſſence.

And I cannot but obſerve, that *Petavius* greatly commends *Boethius*'s explication of this Myſtery, which is the very ſame he had before condemned in *Gregory Nyſſen*, and thoſe other Fathers. That Father, Ibid. p. 430.

ther, Son, and Holy Ghoſt are One God, not Three Gods: *Cujus conjunctionis ratio eſt indifferentia:* The reaſon or manner of which Union and Conjunction is their indifference; that is, ſuch a ſameneſs of Nature, as admits of no difference or variety, or an exact *Homo-ouſiotes*, as he explains it: *Eos enim differentia comitatur, qui vel augent vel minuunt, ut Ariani qui gradibus meritorum Trinitatem variantes diſtrahunt, atq; in pluralitatem deducunt:* Thoſe make a difference, who augment and diminiſh, as the *Arians* do, who diſtinguiſh the Trinity into different Natures as well as Perſons, of different worth and excellency, and thus divide and multiply the Trinity into a plurality of Gods. *Principium enim pluralitatis alteritas eſt: Præter alteritatem enim nec pluralitas quid ſit intelligi poteſt:* For the beginning of plurality is alterity; for we know not what plurality is but alterity: That is, there muſt be ſome difference in the Nature of Things to make them Two or Three, but when the Nature is exactly the ſame, they are but One: which is exactly the ſame account, which *Gregory* gave of it, as I have already ſhewn; and why this ſhould be little better than Hereſie in him, and very good Divinity in *Boethius*, is a little myſterious; for after all, this numerical Unity of Eſſence is nothing elſe, but an ἀπαρράλλακτον ὁμοουσιότης, where there are no ἰδιότητες, as *Maximus* ſpeaks, ſuch an invariable ſameneſs of Nature, as has no differences to diſtinguiſh it, and therefore muſt be One: For theſe Fathers apprehended, that where there was ſuch an exact ſameneſs of Nature, they did mutually exiſt in each other, and were but One Power and Energie, Will and Counſel, and therefore but One Godhead and Monarchy: This *Gregory Nyſſen* inſiſts on, as I ſhewed before, and *Petavius* has quoted

a

a remarkable Teſtimony from *Damaſcen* to this purpoſe; which ſhews alſo, that though they aſſerted but One Humanity, yet they were far enough from thinking, that the Three Divine Perſons are One God, only as *Peter*, *James*, and *John*, are one Man; where he tells us, That the diſtinction and ſeparation between *Peter* and *Paul* is real and viſible, their union and community of Nature only Notional: For we conceive in our Minds, that *Peter* and *Paul* are of the ſame kind, and have but One common Nature: Thus common Nature is diſcerned by Reaſon, but yet it ſubſiſts by Parts, and ſeparately be it ſelf, and is diſtinguiſhed from it ſelf as it ſubſiſts in individuals by many things, ſome peculiar marks and properties: But eſpecially that they do not ſubſiſt in each other but ſeparately, and therefore may by called Two or Three or many Men; (and *Gregory Nyſſen* ſays the ſame, as *Petavius* himſelf owns) but in the moſt ſacred Trinity it is otherwiſe; for there the community of Nature is not a Logical Notion, but is real; from the ſame Eternity, Identity of Subſtance, Action, Will, Agreement of Counſels, Identity of Authority, Power, Goodneſs; I do not ſay Likeneſs, but Identity. Ibid. *p.* 435.

Αὕτη ἒν κοινὴ φύσις τῷ λόγῳ δὲ θεωρητὴ, ἐφ' ἑνὸς δὲ αἱ ὑποστάσεις ἐν ἀλλήλαις εἰσὶν· ἰδία δὲ ἑκάστη καὶ ἀνὰ μέρος, ἤγουν καθ' ἑαυτὴν κεχώρισται, πλείοσι τοῖς διαιρέτοις αὐτὴν ἐκ τῆς ἑτέρας ἔχουσα· πλέον δὲ πάντων τῷ μὴ ἐν ἀλλήλαις, ἀλλὰ κεχωρισμένως εἶναι· ὅθεν καὶ δύο καὶ τρεῖς, ἄνθρωποι λέγονται, καὶ πολλοί.—Ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος τὸ ἀνάπαλιν ἐκεῖ γὰρ τὸ μὴ κοινὸν, καὶ ἐν σχήματι θεωρεῖται, διά τε τὸ σωματῖδιον, καὶ τὸ ταὐτὸν τῆς οὐσίας, καὶ τῆς ἐνεργείας, καὶ τῆς θελήματος, καὶ τῆς γνώμης σύμπνοιαν, πλὴ τε τῆς ἐξουσίας καὶ τῆς δυνάμεως, καὶ τῆς ἀγαθότητος ταυτότητα; ἓν εἶπον ὁμοιότητα ἀλλὰ ταυτότητα. Damaſc. de fide Orthod. l. 1. c. 11.

The numerical Unity then of the Divine Eſſence reſolves it ſelf into thoſe two Principles, the Unity and Identity, of Power and Energie, and that which they call the περιχώρησις, or circumince ſſion, or in being of the Three Divine Perſons in each other, which preſerves the diſtinction of Perſons, but makes the Di-

vine Eſſence numerically One; and indeed theſe Two are but One, and both of them nothing more than what I have explained, I think, a little more intelligibly by a mutual conſciouſneſs, whereby all Three Divine Perſons are mutually in each other, and and have but One Energy and Operation.

De Trinitate, l. 4. c. 15.

That the Fathers univerſally acknowledged, That the Operation of the whole Trinity, *ad extra*, is but One, *Petavius* has proved beyond all contradiction; and hence they conclude the Unity of the Divine Nature and Eſſence; for every Nature has a vertue and energy of its own; for Nature is a principle of Action, and if the Energy and Operation be but One, there can be but One Nature; and if there be Two diſtinct and divided Operations, if either of them can act alone without the other, there muſt be Two divided Natures.

This is certainly true, but yet it gives no account how Three diſtinct Perſons come to have but One Will, One Energy, Power, and Operation; and there is no account to be given of it, that I know of, but what I have now given, *viz.* mutual conſciouſneſs; and that is a very plain account of it: For if all Three Perſons be conſcious to each other, as every Man is to himſelf, there can be but ἓν καὶ ταὐτὸ τῆς θεότητος κίνημά τε καὶ βούλημα, as *Gregory Nazianzen* ſpeaks, but One and the ſame Motion and Will of the Deity; they muſt move and act all together, according to the order and ſubordination of the Divine Perſons; and it is impoſſible they ſhould do ſo without this mutual conſciouſneſs, as it is, that Three Men, who are not conſcious to each other, ſhould have but One ſingle motion of Will, in One ſingle and undivided Act; The Fathers then and I agree in this

this, that the Unity of the Divine Nature and Essence consists in the singularity of Operation; I only add, how this Energy and Operation is, and must be one, by a mutual consciousness, and if this be a reasonable and intelligible account, I hope it is no fault.

And there is no other account to be given of that mutual In-being of the Divine Persons in each other, which they call the περιχώρησις, as Christ tells us, *I am in the Father, and the Father in me*: The necessity of this they saw, from what our Saviour says, and because it is impossible they should be One without such an inseparable and intimate Union and Presence and inhabitation in each other: and therefore *Damascen* tells us, that they cannot go out of each other, nor be separated; but are united and mutually penetrate each other without confusion.

Ἀνεκτοσήτως ὄντας καὶ διαστάτως ἀλλήλων, καὶ ἑνωμένας καὶ ἐν ἀλλήλαις ἀσυγχύτως περιχωρούσας ἐπιστάμεθα. Dam. l. 3. c. 5.

Such an Union as this they all agreed in, as *Petavius* largely shews, but how to explain it they know not; sometimes they are thus intimately united by the sameness of Nature, but this might be the cause of this Union, but not explain what this intimate Union is; sometimes they represent it by corporeal similitudes, which raise gross and material Images in the mind, unworthy of the pure and simple Essence of God: As the mixture and union of the Light of several Candles in the same Room, and of the Colours of the Rainbow, *&c.* which is owing to a material conception of the Divine Substance, and the Union of Substances, which we know nothing of; but had they contemplated God as a pure Mind, it had been easie to explain this *Perichoresis*, or In-dwelling of the Divine Persons in each other: For there is, and can be no other Union of Minds but consciousness, and by a mutual consciousness they are as intimate to each other,

De Trin. l. 4. c. 16.

other, as they are to themſelves ; and are whatever each other is ; as I have explained it at large ; and I hope, this is no fault neither, to give an intelligible Explication of that, which all the Fathers taught, but were not equally happy in their Explications of it.

But to do St. *Auſtin* right, though he do not name this conſciouſneſs, yet he explains this Trinity in Unity by examples of mutual conſciouſneſs : I named one of his Similitudes before, of the Unity of our Underſtanding, Memory, and Will, which are all conſcious to each other ; that we remember what we underſtand and will ; we underſtand what we remember and will ; and what we will, we remember and underſtand ; and therefore all theſe Three Faculties do penetrate and comprehend each other. But his Ninth Book, *De Trinitate*, is ſpent wholly upon this Argument. It is very familiar with the Ancient Fathers to repreſent the Father as the infinite Original Mind ; the Son the Wiſdom of the Father, his Image, or reflex knowledge of himſelf ; and the Holy Spirit that Divine Love, wherewith Father and Son love each other ; St. *Auſtin* takes this ſimilitude of a Mind, its knowledge of its ſelf, and love of its ſelf, and ſhews how theſe are Three and One, which he makes a faint Image of, and reſemblance of a Trinity in Unity. Now the Mind, when it knows its whole ſelf, its knowledge comprehends its whole ſelf; and when it perfectly loves itſelf, it loves its whole ſelf, and its love comprehends its whole ſelf ; and this proves them to be

Supra p. 50.

St. Aug. T. 2. de Trin. l 9.

Igitur ipſa mens, amor & notitia ejus, tria quædam ſunt, & hæc tria unum ſunt, & cùm perfecta ſunt æqualia ſunt.

Mens autem cùm ſe totam novit, hoc eſt, perfectè novit, per totum ejus eſt notitia ejus ; & cùm ſe perfectè amat, totam ſe amat, & per totum eſt amor ejus. — Quomodo autem iſta tria non ſint ejuſdem ſubſtantiæ non video, cùm mens ipſa ſe amet, & ipſa ſe noverit. Atq; ita ſunt hæc tria, ut non alteri alicui rerum mens vel amata vel nota ſit. Unius ergo ejuſdemq; eſſentiæ neceſſe eſt hæc tria ſint.

be of the ſame Subſtance; for the Mind knows it ſelf, and loves it ſelf, and Theſe are ſo Three, that the Mind is known and loved by nothing elſe, and therefore it is neceſſary that theſe Three have One Nature and Eſſence.

He proceeds to ſhew, that this Unity is without all manner of confuſion and mixture, as it is in the Sacred Trinity, where the Perſons are united, but diſtinct; for mixture of Perſons deſtroys the Trinity: and ſhews, how each of them are diſtinct, and then how they are alternately in each other; for the Mind that loves is in the love, and love in the knowledge of the Lover, and knowledge in the knowing Mind; and how each of them is in the other two; for the Mind, which knows and loves it ſelf, is in its own knowledge and love; and the love of the Mind, which knows and loves it ſelf, is in its own knowledge; and the knowledge of the Mind which knows and loves it ſelf is in the Mind, and in its love; becauſe it loves it ſelf knowing, and knows it ſelf loving; and thus alſo two are in each, for the Mind which knows and loves it ſelf, with its knowledge is in love, and with its love is in knowledge; for love and knowledge are together in the Mind, which loves and knows it ſelf: and the whole is in the whole; for the whole Mind loves it ſelf, and knows its whole ſelf, and knows its whole love, and loves its whole knowledge. I need not tell any Man, that this is the mutual conſciouſneſs which I have deſcribed, and by this St. *Auſtin* re-

In alternis autem ita ſunt quia mens amans in amore eſt, & amor in amantis notitia, & notitia in mente noſcente. Singula in binis ita ſunt, quia mens quæ ſe novit & amat, in amore & notitia ſua eſt: & amor amantis mentis, ſeſeq; ſcientis in mente notitiaq; ejus eſt; & notitia mentis ſe ſcientis & amantis in mente atq; amore ejus eſt, quia ſcientem ſe amat, & amantem ſe novit. Ac per hoc & bina in ſingulis, quia mens quæ ſe novit & amat, cum ſua notitia eſt in amore, & cum ſuo amore in notitia; amor quippe ipſe & notitia ſimul ſunt in mente quæ ſe amat & novit. Tota verò in totis quemadmodum ſint jam ſupra oſtendimus, cùm ſe tota mens amat, & totam novit, et totum amorem ſuum novit, totamq; amat notitiam ſuam.

represents the Trinity in Unity; and I hope his Authority will defend me from the charge of Innovation; and I am sure the reason of the thing will defend it self.

But for the better understanding of this, we must further observe, that the Fathers resolve the Unity of the Godhead into the Unity of Principle: that is, though there be Three Divine Persons in the Godhead, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, yet the Father is the Original Fountain of the Deity, who begets the Son of his own Substance, and from whom, and the Son, the Holy Ghost eternally proceeds, of the same Substance with Father and Son: So that there is but One Principle and Fountain of the Deity, and therefore but One God.

But this, as *Petavius* well observes, does not of it self prove the Unity of the Godhead, but only the ὁμοσιότης, or sameness of Nature; and therefore the Fathers add, That God begets a Son not without but within himself; For the Wisdom of God is within him, and inseparable from him: This they illustrated by the Sun, its light and splendour, which are coæval and inseparable; by the Fountain and its Streams; by a Tree and its Branches, which are united in One; which Comparisons must not be strained farther than they were intended, as if Father, Son, and Holy Ghost were One in the same manner, as the Sun and its Light, or the Tree and its Branches, or the Fountain, River, and Streams, but only that there is such a natural and

Τὰ κτιζόμενα καὶ ποιούμενα ἔξωθεν τοῦ ποιοῦντος, ὁ δὲ υἱὸς οὐκ ἔξωθεν, ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ γεννῶντος πατρὸς ἐστί. Athan. Nic. Decret. p. 261.

Καὶ τὴν σοφίαν ὃν λέγων οὐδὲν ἦπιον τὸ μὴ ἔξωθεν, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ πάλιν φερνεῖς. p. 265.

Καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ δὴ ἀδιαιρέτως —— ὑπάρχων ἀϊδίως ἀπαύγασμα φωτός. p. 268.

and eſſential Union between the Divine Perſons, as makes them One numerical God.

But there is ſomething ſtill to be added to this to compleat this Notion, that as the Father is the Fountain of the Deity, and the Son and Holy Ghoſt inſeparably united to him, ſo Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt are eſſential to One God, as St. *Auſtin* calls the Trinity, *Unam quandam ſummam rem*, One Supreme Thing: And as all acknowledge, that the Three Perſons are One God, and ſince God is the moſt neceſſary Being, all Three Perſons are neceſſary and eſſential to One God: That there muſt neceſſarily be Three Divine Perſons in the Unity of the Godhead, and there can be no more.

Aug. l. 1. De Doct. Chriſt. c. 5.

For the explication of this I ſhall proceed by theſe ſteps, which are all plain and univerſally acknowledged.

1. That there are no Accidents, nor Qualities, nor Faculties in God, as there are in created Spirits; but whatever is in God is οὐσιώδες, Eſſence and Subſtance, a pure and ſimple Act. This is univerſally acknowledged by all Chriſtians; St. *Auſtin* affirms, that there are no Accidents in God: *Athanaſius*, That there is no Compoſition in God, as between Subſtance and Accident, (and it is much a-like, as to Mind and its different Faculties and Powers, which is a Compoſition) but that God is ἁπλοῦν τι, a pure ſimple Act: But there is no need of Teſtimonies to prove that, which Natural Reaſon proves, for nothing can be Eternal and Self-originated, but a pure and ſimple Act, for what is compounded is made; for it wants a Maker.

Aug. de Trin. l. 5. c. 5.

Athan. Syn. Nicænæ Decr. p. 271.

2. That it is eſſential to an eternal Mind to know it ſelf, and to love it ſelf; for this is eſſential to a Mind; no humane Mind can be without it, much leſs the moſt perfect and excellent Mind; and therefore God does know himſelf, and love himſelf and his own Image.

3. That Original Mind and Wiſdom, and the Knowledge of it ſelf, and love of it ſelf, and its own Image, are diſtinct Acts, and never can be One ſimple, individual Act. They are diſtinct Powers and Faculties in Men, Knowledge, Self-reflection, and Love, and are ſo diſtinct, that they can never be the ſame: Knowledge is not Self-reflection, nor Love either Knowledge or Self-reflection, though they are inſepably united, they are diſtinct.

4. Therefore theſe three Acts, which are ſo diſtinct, that they can never be the ſame, muſt be three ſubſtantial Acts in God; that is, three Divine ſubſiſting Perſons; for there is nothing but Eſſence and Subſtance in God; no Accident, or Faculties, as there are in Creatures.

5. That theſe are the true and proper Characters of the diſtinct Perſons in the ever bleſſed Trinity. The Father is Original Mind and Wiſdom; the Son the Word and Wiſdom of the Father; that is, the reflex Knowledge of himſelf, which is the perfect Image of his own Wiſdom; the Holy Ghoſt, that Divine Love which Father and Son have for each other: It would be very impertinent to confirm this by the Authority of the ancient Fathers, becauſe all Men, who know any thing of them, know that this is their conſtant language.

I am ſure this is very agreeable to the Language of Scripture, and anſwers all thoſe Characters we find there of the Son and Holy Ghoſt.

The

The Son is expreſly called the Word and the Wiſdom of God. That Word, *which was in the beginning, which was with God, and was God*, 1 *John* 1. For God did certainly always know himſelf, and therefore the Word was always with God, intimately preſent with him, not as our tranſient and vaniſhing Reflections are, but as a permanent and ſubſtantial Word, the ſubſiſting and living Image of his Father's Wiſdom: As he is called *the Brightneſs of his Father's Glory, and the expreſs Image of his Perſon*, 1 *Heb.* 2. His Father's Glory and Perſon is Eternal and Original Wiſdom; He is his Father's begotten Wiſdom, or the bright Reflection of his Wiſdom; which is as perfect and exact, as the Father's Knowledge of himſelf. And therefore St. *John* might well ſay, *No man hath ſeen God at any time, the only begotten Son, who is in the boſom of the Father, he hath declared him*, 1 *John* 18. And our Saviour might well tell us, *As the Father knoweth me, even ſo know I the Father*, 10 *John* 15. that he ſeeth all that the Father doth: That he receiveth all his Commands from the Father, that he that ſeeth him, ſeeth the Father, and many ſuch like Expreſſions he uſes to ſignifie his perfect Knowledge of his Father; for he is that Wiſdom and Knowledge, wherewith his Father knows himſelf; and if the Father perfectly knows himſelf, he is the perfect Image and Wiſdom of the Father.

For this reaſon he is called the *Son*, becauſe he is the perfect Image of the Father, begotten of his own Eternal Wiſdom, by a reflex Act upon himſelf: For he begets his own Son in his own likeneſs by knowing himſelf; and therefore the Son muſt be of the ſame Nature, the very Wiſdom of the Father, unleſs the Father knows himſelf otherwiſe than he really is.

This is the Eternal Son and Word of God, whereby he made the Worlds; for it is this reflex Knowledge and Wisdom, which makes all things: The Eternal Ideas of Truth and Wisdom in the Divine Mind effect nothing, no more than meer Speculation does in us, till it is brought into Act by reflection; for it was this reflex Knowledge, which took the Patterns of things for the new World, and gave being to them; and therefore God made the World by his Son and begotten Wisdom; who doth all things by seeing what the Father doth, as the Father doth all things by seeing himself in his reflex and begotten Wisdom; for the Father and the Son are one single Energy and Operation.

This is that eternal Word and Reason, that *true*
1 John 9. *Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world*, which communicates the light of Reason, and the eternal Idea's of Truth to Mankind: This is that Son, who reveals the Father to us, and acquaints us
v. 18. with his secret Counsels for the Salvation of Sinners.
v. 14. This is that word, which became Flesh and dwelt among us, who hath undertaken the Work of our Redemption, and is become the Wisdom of God, and
1 Cor. 1. 24. the Power of God to Salvation to them that believe: For all the natural Communications of Wisdom and Reason; all the new Discoveries of the Divine Wisdom; whatever the Divine Wisdom immediately does, must be done by this begotten Wisdom; that is, by a reflex Wisdom, which is the Principle of Action and Execution: And therefore as God made the World by his Word, so also he redeems the World by his Incarnate Word; this being as immediate an effect of the Divine Wisdom and Counsel, as his Creation of the World.

As

As for the Holy Ghoſt, whoſe Nature is repreſented to be Love, I do not indeed find in Scripture, that it is any where ſaid, that the Holy Ghoſt is that mutual Love, wherewith Father and Son love each other: But this we know, that there is a mutual Love between Father and Son: *The Father loveth the Son,* 3 John 35. *and hath given all things into his hands. And the Father loveth the Son, and ſheweth him all things, that himſelf doth.* And our Saviour himſelf tells us, *I love* 5 John 20. 14 John 31. *the Father.* And I ſhewed before, that Love is a diſtinct Act, and therefore in God muſt be a Perſon; for there are no Accidents nor Faculties in God. And that the Holy Spirit is a Divine Perſon is ſufficiently evident in Scripture: For he is the Spirit of God, who knows what is in God, as the Spirit of Man knows what is in Man, and he is the Spirit of Chriſt, who receiveth of the things of Chriſt: And his peculiar Character in Scripture is Love; which ſhews us, what he is in his own Nature, as well as what he is in his Effects and Operations, for Nature and Energy is the ſame in God. 1 Cor. 2. 11. 1 John 4. 16.

It is by this Holy Spirit, that the Love of God is ſhed abroad in our Hearts, 5 *Rom.* 5. *The love of God is ſhed abroad in our hearts, by the Holy Ghoſt which is given unto us.* For this Spirit is the eſſential Love of God, and therefore both inſpires us with the Love of God, and gives us a feeling ſenſe of God's Love to us.

He is the Spirit of the Son, the Spirit of adoption, 8 Rom. 15. *whereby we cry Abba Father, and which cries in our hearts Abba Father. The Spirit of the Son*; that is, 4 Gal. 6. of the eternal and only begotten Son; that very Spirit, whereby the eternal Son calls God Father, whereby the Father owns the Son, and the Son the Father; that

that is, that essential Love, which is between Father and Son; and therefore where-ever this Spirit of the Son is, it will call God Father, will cry *Abba Father*; that is, is a Spirit of Adoption in us; for the eternal Spirit of the Son, dwells only in Sons; by our Union to Christ, who is the eternal Son of God, we become his adopted Sons, and as such the Spirit of the Son dwells in us.

And therefore the Fruits and Operations of the Spirit answer this Character. *For the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness,* 5 Gal. 22. *meekness*, which are the Communications of the Spirit of Love.

This shews the difference between Generation and Procession, between being a Son, and the Spirit of God: Generation, as I observed before, is a reflex Act, whereby God begets his own Image and likeness; it is God's Knowledge of himself, which to be sure is his own perfect Image; and the living essential Image of God is his Son: For to be a Son is to be begotten of his Father's Substance, in his own likeness and Image: But the Divine Spirit, or this Eternal Love proceeds from God, is not a reflex but a direct Act, as all Thoughts and Passions are said to proceed out of the Heart: A reflex Act turns upon it self, and begets its own likeness, but Love is a direct Act, and comes out of the Heart, and thus does this eternal Love proceed from God: Besides, this eternal Love is not the Image of God, but his eternal complacency in himself and his own Image, and therefore is not a Son begotten of him, but the eternal Spirit which proceeds from him. It is true this eternal subsisting Love, which is the Third Person of the Trinity, has all the Perfections of Father and Son in himself; for Love must

muſt have the perfect Idea of what it loves, and therefore this ſubſiſting Love muſt have all thoſe Perfections in himſelf, which are the Eternal Object and Cauſe of this Eternal Love; but his eſſential Character is Love, and though Love has the whole Divine Perfections in it ſelf, yet it has them not as a Son, not as the Image of God.

This gives a plain Account alſo, how he is the Spirit of the Father, and the Spirit of the Son, and according to the Profeſſion of the *Latin* Church, proceeds both from Father and Son; for this Divine Love eternally proceeds from God's reflex Knowledge of himſelf, or ſeeing himſelf in his own Image: He loves himſelf in his Image, and therefore the Spirit proceeds from Father and Son; that is, from the Original, and the Image, by One undivided Act: As every Man loves himſelf in that Idea and Image he has formed of himſelf in his own Mind.

And no Man will wonder, that the Creation of the World is aſcribed to the Holy Spirit, as well as to the Father and Son, for it is Eternal Love which gives Being to all Things, which is the Author and Giver of Life, without which Infinite Wiſdom and Power produces no One Effect: Original Wiſdom contains the Ideas of all things, and begotten Wiſdom can frame the Natures of Things according to the Original Ideas of the Divine Mind, but it is Love which gives Being to them.

6. From hence it is clear, That theſe Three Divine Perſons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, are One God, as theſe Three Powers, of Underſtanding, Self-reflection, and Self-love are One Mind: For what are meer Faculties and Powers in created Spirits, are Perſons in the Godhead, really diſtinct from each other,

ther, but as inſeparably united into One, as Three different Powers are eſſentially united in One Mind: There is a vaſt difference indeed between them, as there is between God and Creatures; the Mind is but One, the Faculties and Powers more, but theſe being only Faculties and Powers, neither of them is a whole entire Mind: The Underſtanding alone is not the whole entire Mind, nor Reflexion, nor Love, but the Mind is whole and entire by the Union of them all in One: But theſe being Perſons in the Godhead, each Perſon has the whole Divine Nature: The Son has all that the Father has, being his perfect and natural Image, and the Holy Spirit, is all that Father and Son is, comprehending all their infinite Perfections in Eternal Love: and they are all the ſame, and all united into One God, as the ſeveral Faculties and Powers are in One Mind.

7. For this proves, that theſe Divine Perſons are intimately conſcious to each other, which, as I before ſhewed, makes them One numerical God: For as the ſame Mind is conſcious to all its own Faculties and Powers, and by that unites them into One; ſo where there are Divine and Infinite Perſons inſtead of Faculties and Powers, they muſt be mutually conſcious to each other, to make them all One God.

8. This proves alſo, that though there are Three diſtinct Perſons, there can be but One Energy and Operation; Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt is the Maker and Governor of the World by One inſeparable and undivided Energy: neither of them do nor can act apart: as the ſeveral Powers of the Mind all concur to the ſame individual Action; Knowledge, Self-reflection, and Will, do the ſame thing, which is the Effect of Knowledge brought into act by Reflection and

and Will: And yet the Effect may be aſcribed to Knowledge, and aſcribed to Will, as the making of the World is to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghoſt; not ſeparately to either, but as they act in Conjunction, and produce the ſame Effect by One individual Energie and Power.

9. This proves alſo, that Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, muſt be co-eternal, as the ſeveral Powers and Faculties muſt be co-temporary, and co-exiſt in the ſame Mind. Underſtanding cannot be without a Power of Reflexion, nor that without Will and Love. And I ſuppoſe, no Man will ſay, that there could be any imaginable inſtant, wherein God did not know and love himſelf.

This Account is very agreeable to what St. *Auſtin* has given us; who repreſents the Father to be Original Mind, the Son his Knowledge of himſelf, and the Holy Spirit Divine Love, as I have done; and gives the very ſame Account of their Union. *Cùm itaque ſe mens novit & amat, jungitur ei amore verbum ejus, & quoniam amat notitiam, & novit amorem, & verbum in amore eſt, & amor in verbo, & utrumque in amante & dicente.* When the Mind knows and loves it ſelf, its Word is united to it by Love, and becauſe it loves its Knowledge, and knows its Love; its Word is in Love, and Love in its Word, and both in the loving, and ſpeaking or knowing Mind. This is the Eternal Generation of the Son: *Itaque mens cùm ſeipſam cognoſcit, ſola parens eſt notitiæ ſuæ, & cognitum enim & cognitor ipſa eſt*; When the Mind knows it ſelf, it is the ſole Parent of its own Knowledge; for its ſelf is both the Knower and the Thing known; that is, the Son is begotten of the Father by a reflex Knowledge of himſelf;

S. *Aug.* Tom. 3 de Trin. l. 9.

and he gives us the ſame Account of the Difference between Generation and Proceſſion; that One is a new Production (if I may ſo expreſs it) *inventum, partum, & repertum,* that is the Production of its own Image, of its own Wiſdom and Knowledge by Self reflection; the other comes out of the Mind, as Love does, and therefore the Mind is the Principle of it, but not its Parent. *Cur itaque amando ſe non genuiſſe dicatur amorem ſuum, ſicut cognoſcendo ſe genuit notitiam ſuam: In eo quidem manifeſte oſtenditur, hoc amoris eſſe principium undè procedit: Ab ipſa quidem mente procedit, quæ ſibi eſt amabilis antequam ſe amet: atque ita principium eſt amoris ſui, quo ſe amat; ſed ideo non rectè dicitur genitus ab ea, ſicut notitia ſui, quâ ſe novit; quia notitia jam inventum eſt, quod partum vel repertum dicitur, quod ſæpe præcedit inquiſitio eo fine quietura.*

This I hope is ſufficient both to explain and juſtifie this Doctrine (which is the great Fundamental of the Chriſtian Religion) of a Trinity in Unity, and Unity in Trinity, and that account I have given of it. It muſt be confeſſed, that the ancient Fathers did not expreſs their Senſe in the ſame terms that I have done, but I will leave any indifferent and impartial Reader to judge, whether they do not ſeem to have intended the very ſame Explication, which I have now given of this venerable Myſtery.

As for the Schoolmen, they generally pretend to follow the Fathers, and have no Authority, where they leave them: Sometimes they ſeem to miſtake their Senſe, or to clog it with ſome peculiar niceties and Diſtinctions of their own. The truth is, that which has confounded this Myſtery, has been the vain endeavour of reducing it to terms of Art: ſuch as Nature, Eſſence, Subſtance Subſiſtence, Hypoſtaſis, Perſon,

ſon, and the like, which ſome of the Fathers uſed in a very different Senſe from each other; which ſometimes occaſioned great Diſputes among them; not becauſe they differed in the Faith, but becauſe they uſed words ſo differently, as not to underſtand each others meaning, as *Petavius* has ſhown at large. The more pure and ſimple Age of the Church contented themſelves to profeſs the Divinity of Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt; that there was but One God, and Three, who were this One God; which is all the Scripture teaches of it. But when *Sabellius* had turned this Myſtery only into a Trinity of Names, they thought themſelves concerned to ſay, what theſe Three are, who are One God: and then they nicely diſtinguiſhed between Perſon and Hypoſtaſis, and Nature and Eſſence, and Subſtance, that they were Three Perſons, but One Nature, Eſſence and Subſtance; but then when men curiouſly examined the ſignification of theſe words, they found, that upon ſome account or other they were very unapplicable to this Myſtery: For what is the Subſtance and Nature of God? How can Three diſtinct Perſons have but one Numerical Subſtance? what is the diſtinction between Eſſence, and Perſonality and Subſiſtence? the Deity is above Nature, and above terms of Art; there is nothing like this myſterious Diſtinction and Unity, and therefore no wonder, if we want proper words to expreſs it by, at leaſt that ſuch Names as ſignifie the Diſtinction and Unity of Creatures, ſhould not reach it. I do not think it impoſſible to give a tolerable Account of the School-terms and diſtinctions, but that is a work of greater difficulty than uſe, eſpecially to ordinary Chriſtians, and I have drawn this Section to too great a length already to enter upon that now.

SECT. VI

Concerning Expounding *Scripture by Reason.*

Creed. FOR *like as we are compelled by the Christian Verity to acknowledge every Person by himself to be God and Lord.*

So are we forbidden by the Catholick Religion, to say, there be Three Gods and Three Lords.

Notes. *By the Christian Verity I suppose is meant, the Sacred Books which contain the Christian Religion, that is, the Books of the Old and New Testament. But do these Books, and does this Verity compel us to the acknowledgment of Three Persons, each of which, is by himself Supreme God, and Lord, and yet all of them together but One God? Doth, I say, the Holy Scripture compel us to this contradictory acknowledgment? Is there any Text alledged from Scripture, which all the Unitarians, and some or other of the most learned Trinitarians, do not easily interpret in such Sense, that the Unity of God is preserved, and no more than One Person (even the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ) acknowledged to be God? See the History of the Unitarians. But if there is no Text of Scripture, but what is in the Opinion of some or other of their own Learned Men, fairly capable of a Sense contrary to the Faith delivered in this Creed, then we are not compelled to acknowledge this Faith. And the truth is, the Contest between the Unitarians and Trinitarians is not, as is commonly thought, a Clash of Reason with Scripture; but it layeth here, whether, when the Holy Scriptnre may be understood as teaching only One God, or but One who is God,*

God, which agrees with the reſt of Scripture, and with Naturnal Reaſon, we muſt notwithſtanding preferr an Interpretation of it that is abſurd, and contrary to it ſelf, to reaſon, and to the reſt of Scripture, ſuch as the Trinitarians Interpretation (expreſt in this Creed) appears to be! In a word, the Queſtion only is, Whether we ought to Interpret Holy Scripture, when it ſpeaks of God, according to Reaſon, or not, that is, like fools, or like wiſe Men.

Anſwer. There is nothing in this long Paragragh to trouble an Anſwerers thoughts, but a great deal to exerciſe his Patience, if he be apt to be provoked by Arrogance and Folly.

His firſt Argument to prove, that the Holy Scriptures do not compel us to confeſs each Perſon in the ever bleſſed Trinity to be God and Lord, and yet that there is but One God, is becauſe it is *a contradictory Acknowledgement:* So he ſays, and has endeavoured to prove it, and how vainly and impertinently, I leave the Reader to judge; but if a Trinity in Unity imply no Contradiction, as I am perſwaded, I have evidently proved; then I hope the Scripture may teach this Doctrine, and require the belief of it: but this is an impudent Argument, which brings Revelation down in ſuch ſublime Myſteries to the level of our Underſtandings, to ſay, ſuch a Doctrine cannot be contained in Scripture, becauſe it implies a Contradiction; whereas a modeſt Man would firſt inquire, whether it be in Scripture or not, and if it be plainly contained there, he would conclude, how unintelligible ſoever it appeared to him, that yet there is no Contradiction in it, becauſe it is taught by Scriture: We muſt not indeed expound Scripture contrary

trary to common Senſe, and to the common Reaſon of Mankind, in ſuch Matters as every man knows, and every man can judge of; but in Matters of pure Revelation, which we have no natural Idea of, and know nothing of but what is revealed, we muſt not pretend ſome imaginary Contradictions to reject the plain and expreſs Authority of a Revelation; for it is impoſſible to know, what is a Contradiction to the Natures of Things, whoſe Natures we do not underſtand; as I ſhewed before.

His next Proof, that the Scripture does not compel us to this Acknowledgment, is, that the Unitarians, and ſome of the moſt Learned Trinitarians expound theſe Texts of Scripture, which are alledged for a Trinity in Unity to another Senſe, and eaſily reconcile them with the Belief and Acknowledgment of One only, who is God, as well as of One God; and for this he refers us to that Learned Piece, the Hiſtory of the Unitarians.

As for examining particular Texts, which are alledged on both ſides in this Controverſie, it is too voluminous a Work at preſent, and beſides my preſent Undertaking, which is only to vindicate the *Athanaſian* Creed, and the true Chriſtian Doctrine of a Trinity in Unity, from the pretended Abſurdities and Contradictions charged on it in theſe Notes, and when that is done, (and I hope I have done it) I dare truſt any Man of competent Underſtanding to judge which is moſt agreeable to the Scope and Language of Scripture.

But as for what he ſays, that the Unitarians or Socinians can eaſily reconcile all the Texts of Scripture alledged for the proof of a Trinity, to their Notion of One God in oppoſition to Three Divine Perſons in the Godhead, we muſt let him ſay ſo, becauſe

cauſe he will ſay it, as all other Hereticks pretend Scripture to be on their ſide; but to ſay, that they can *eaſily* do this, is a little impudent, when all Men, who underſtand this Controverſie, ſee what Art they uſe, and what forced and arbitrary Interpretations they put on Scripture to reconcile it to their Opinions; eſpecially when ſome of the moſt learned *Socinians* ſtick not to confeſs, That they will expound Scripture to any ſence, rather than acknowledge ſuch Doctrines, as they think ſo contradictory to the Reaſon and Underſtanding of Mankind; which no modeſt Man would own, were he not ſenſible of the harſhneſs and uncouthneſs of his own Expoſitions; for things are come to a deſperate paſs, when they ſhall reſolve upon any ſenſe, or no ſence, rather than that, which the words moſt aptly and properly ſignifie, but lies croſs to their Prejudices and pre-conceived Opinions: But what thinks he of *Socinus*'s Expoſition of that Text, where Chriſt ſays, That *he came down from Heaven*; which he could not do, if he had no being, before he was born of the Virgin *Mary*? Did *Socinus* find it ſo eaſie a thing to reconcile this Text to his darling Opinion; when he was fain to faſt and to pray for it, and to pretend Revelation, becauſe he wanted Reaſon to ſupport it? *viz.* That Chriſt before he entred on his Prophetick Office, was taken up into Heaven to be inſtructed in the Goſpel, and then came down from Heaven again to publiſh it to the World: Whereas our Saviour plainly ſpeaks of his firſt coming into the World, when he was born of the Virgin, and the whole Hiſtory of the Goſpel takes no notice of his being taken up into Heaven before his Reſurrection from the dead; I think this was no eaſie Expoſition; but of this more preſently.

That

That there are no Texts of Scripture alledged for the proof of a Trinity, but what are rejected by one or other of the moſt learned *Trinitarians*, is as true as the other: There are many Texts, which all hearty *Trinitarians* do, and muſt agree in, and whoever rejects them, whatever name he goes by, can be no better than a Socinian in diſguiſe; but however there are no Texts alledged by learned *Trinitarians*, but are acknowledged by ſome or other of his learned *Trinitarians*, and thus it is as broad as long; but it is not the Authority of any modern Expoſitors, which we rely on, but their Reaſon; and if a learned *Trinitarian* ſhould reject any Text without Reaſon or Learning, it ſignifies no more to us, than the Expoſitions of a learned *Socinian*: When we ſeek for Authority we go higher, to the Primitive Fathers of the Catholick Church, and there we find it. They not only delivered to us the Traditionary Doctrines of a Trinity, which had always been taught in the Catholick Church, but the Traditionary Expoſition of thoſe Scriptures too, whereon this Doctrine is founded; and they being ſo near the Head and Fountain of Tradition, the Apoſtolick Age, their Authority is venerable; and a modeſt and prudent Man will not reject any interpretation of Scripture, which relates to Articles of Faith, and is unanimouſly delivered by the Ancient Fathers, if the Words in any tolerable conſtruction will bear the ſenſe: for though a Text ſhould fairly bear two different interpretations, that is moſt likely to be true, which has been from the beginning taught by the Catholick Church: And I challenge this Author to name any Text, which is alledged for the proof of a Trinity by learned *Trinitarians*, which has not been uſed to the ſame purpoſe

poſe by many, or moſt, or all the ancient Fathers, who have alledged thoſe Texts.

But his Concluſion from hence, that therefore the Scripture does not compel us to acknowledge a Trinity in Unity, becauſe the *Unitarians*, and ſome or other of the moſt Learned *Trinitarians*, expound theſe Texts to another Senſe, is very pleaſant, and ſhows what a great Maſter of Reaſon he is: For his Argument is this; the Scripture does not compel us to believe any thing, while there are other Men, who expound the Scripture to a contrary Senſe; and thus I am ſure the Scripture compels us to believe nothing; for it will be hard to name any Text, which concerns any Article of Faith, how plain and expreſs ſoever it be, but what has been expounded to a contrary Senſe by one Heretick or other. I would ask this Author, whether the Scripture compels him to believe but *One God*, in his Senſe of it; that is, *but One who is God?* If it does not, why does he believe it, and inſiſt ſo peremptorily on it, in defiance of the whole Catholick Church? And yet how can the Scripture compel him to this, when the Catholick Church, and the Catholick Doctors in all Ages, have expounded Scripture to a contrary ſenſe, that there are Three Divine Perſons, who are this One God? At this rate, when Men differ in their Expoſitions of Scripture, the Scripture does not compel us to believe either; and thus notwithſtanding the Scripture, we may believe nothing. If the Scripture have a determined Senſe, we are bound to believe that Senſe, and muſt anſwer it to God, and to our Saviour, if we do not, whoever expounds it otherwiſe; and therefore when it is ſaid in the Creed, *that we are compelled* (ἀναγκαζόμεθα are under a neceſſity) *by the Chriſtian Verity to acknowledge*

each Person by himself to be God and Lord; the meaning is, not that Men are under any force to believe or acknowledge it, or to expound Scripture to this sense; but that the true Sense and Exposition of Scripture does make this Acknowledgment necessary, if we will believe as the Scripture teaches; and this may be true, whatever the *Unitarians*, or any Learned *Trinitarians* teach.

He adds; That *the Contest between the* Unitarians *and* Trinitarians, *is not a clash of Reason with Scripture*; *but whether we ought to interpret Holy Scripture, when it speaks of God according to Reason, or not*; *that is, like Fools, or like wise Men.* Now this is all sham, and fallacy: For *to expound Scripture by Reason*, may signifie two very different things. 1. To use our own Reason to find out the true Sense and Interpretation of Scripture. 2. To expound Scripture in Conformity to the Principles and Maxims of Natural Reason. In the first Sense he expounds Scripture according to Reason, who considers the Use and Propriety of Words, the Scope and Design of the Place, what goes before, and what follows, and how one place of Scripture is consistent with another, just in the same way as we find out the Sense of any human Writing; and he who does not thus expound Scripture by Reason, expounds it *like a Fool*; that is, if he put such a Sense upon it, as the Words will not bear, or the Scope and Design of the Text will not admit, and as no Man would think of, who were not prepossessed and prejudiced against what appears to be the plain and obvious Sense of the Text, and whether they, or we, in this Sense, expound Scripture according, or contrary, to Reason, *like Fools, or like wise Men*, shall be examined presently.

As

As for the other Senſe of expounding Scripture according to Reaſon; that is, in Conformity to the Principles and Maxims of Natural Reaſon; we allow this too ſo far, that we muſt not expound Scripture to ſuch a ſenſe, as contradicts the plain and expreſs Maxims of Natural Reaſon; for though God reveals ſuch things to us, as Natural Reaſon could not diſcover, and cannot comprehend, yet Revelation cannot contradict plain Reaſon; for Truth can never contradict it ſelf; what is true in Revelation, can never be falſe in Reaſon; and what is true by Natural Reaſon can never be falſe in Revelation; but then as I obſerved before, we muſt be ſure that there is ſuch a Contradiction; it muſt be evident and expreſs, and not made out of uncertain Conſequences, which many times are not owing to the Nature of Things, but to the Imperfection of our own Knowledge: As to keep to the Matter of our preſent Diſpute;

Natural Reaſon tells us, That there is, and can be, but One Supreme God, the Sovereign Lord of the World, and ſhould any Man pretend to prove from Scripture, that there are Three Gods, this would be an expreſs Contradiction to the Natural Belief of One God, and therefore we muſt reject this Senſe of Scripture, as contrary to Reaſon: but to prove from Scripture, that there is but One God, and that there are Three, who are this One God, this is no Contradiction to Reaſon, which teaches but One God; for Scripture teaches the ſame, and all *Trinitarians* acknowledge the ſame, and muſt do ſo, if they believe the *Athanaſian* Creed; and therefore the belief of the Trinity does not contradict the natural belief of One God. Yes, you'll ſay, that there ſhould be Three Perſons, each of which is God, and yet but

One God, is a Contradiction: But what Principle of Natural Reason does it contradict? Reason tells us, that Three Gods cannot be One God, but does Reason tell us, that Three Divine Persons cannot be One God? If my Reason be like other Mens, I am sure, my Reason says nothing at all about it, does neither affirm, nor deny it; and therefore when the Scripture assures us, that there is but One God as Natural Reason teaches, and that this One God is Three Divine Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, this contradicts nothing which Reason teaches, but adds something, which Natural Reason could not discover, which is the proper use of Revelation. Scripture teaches, that there is but One God, and that there are Three Divine Persons, who are this One God: Reason teaches, that there is but One God, but does not teach that there are Three Divine Persons in the Unity of the Godhead, nor does it teach that there are not; and therefore though the Scripture teaches more than Natural Reason does (which I suppose may be allowed by these Adorers of Reason) yet it teaches nothing contrary to what Natural Reason teaches; nay, these Men cannot graft any Contradiction upon it, without perverting the Faith of the ever blessed Trinity, as it is taught in Scripture, and has always been taught in the Catholick Church; that is, to find a Contradiction, their business is to prove, that these Three Divine Persons, each of which is God, must be Three distinct Gods, and then Three distinct Gods cannot be One God: This I grant, and their Argument is unanswerable to those, who own these Three Divine Persons, to be Three distinct Gods; but what is that to us, who teach, that they are not Three distinct Gods, but One God, as the Scripture teaches, and

and the Catholick Church always taught, and as of neceſſity we muſt teach, if we believe a Trinity in Unity? So that there is no Contradiction in our Faith, for that which they make a Contradiction is not our Faith, but a Contradiction to our Faith, as well as to common Senſe and Reaſon. Well! But if we believe Three diſtinct Divine Perſons, each of which is God, we muſt believe Three diſtinct Gods: I hope not, when we profeſs to believe but One God; yes, whatever we profeſs to believe, Three ſuch diſtinct Perſons, muſt be Three Gods; now this we deny, and challenge them to produce any plain Principle of Reaſon to prove, that it muſt be ſo; Natural Reaſon teaches nothing about the Perſonality of the Godhead; it teaches One God, but whether this One God, be One or Three Perſons, it ſays not, and therefore it may be either, without contradicting the Natural Notions we have of One God; and then here is free ſcope for Revelation; and if Revelation teaches, that there is but One God, and that there are Three Divine Perſons, each of which in Scripture have not only the Title, but the Nature and Attributes of God aſcribed to them, then we muſt of neceſſity believe a Trinity in Unity; Three Perſons and One God; for what the Scripture affirms, and Reaſon does not deny, is a proper Object of our Faith: and then their Objection againſt this Faith, that theſe Three Divine Perſons, muſt be Three diſtinct Gods, if each of them be God, is ſenſleſs and ridiculous; for it is demonſtrable, that if there be Three Perſons and One God, each Perſon muſt be God, and yet there cannot be Three diſtinct Gods, but One. For if each Perſon be not God, all Three cannot be God, unleſs the Godhead have Perſons in it, which are not God; and if all Three

Three are but One God, they cannot be Three distinct Gods: so that whoever believes the Three Divine Persons to be Three distinct Gods, does not believe a Trinity in Unity; and whoever believes a Trinity in Unity, cannot believe Three distinct Gods, and if there be a Trinity in Unity, each Person must be God, and yet there cannot be Three Gods, but One God; and now let him go look for his Contradiction in the belief of Three Persons, and One God, and when he has found it, let me hear from him again.

So that all his Absurdities and Contradictions are vanished only into *Nicodemus* his Question, *How can these things be?* And if I could give him no other Answer, I should think it a very good one to say, *God knows.* Must we deny every thing that we can't conceive and comprehend, though it be expresly taught by God himself? Must we deny what we read in the Bible to be there, because Reason does not teach it, and cannot frame an Adequate Idea of it?

But I have not done with our Author thus, but must give him a little more about expounding Scripture according to Reason: For I affirm, that Natural Reason is not the Rule and Measure of expounding Scripture, no more than it is of expounding any other Writing. The true and only way to interpret any Writing, even the Scriptures themselves, is to examine the use and propriety of Words and Phrases, the Connexion, Scope, and Design of the Text, its Allusion to ancient Customs and Usages, or Disputes, *&c.* For there is no other good Reason to be given for any Exposition, but that the Words signifie so, and the Circumstances of the Place, and the apparent Scope of the Writer requires it.

But

But our Author (as many others do) ſeems to confound the Reaſons of Believing any Doctrine, with the Rules of Expounding a Writing. We muſt believe nothing that contradicts the plain and expreſs Dictates of Natural Reaſon, which all Mankind agree in, whatever pretence of Revelation there be for it; well, ſay they, then you muſt expound Scripture ſo as to make it agree with the neceſſary Principles and Dictates of Reaſon: No, ſay I, that does not follow; I muſt expound Scripture according to the uſe and ſignification of the Words, and muſt not force my own Senſe on it, if it will not bear it. But ſuppoſe then, that the Natural Conſtruction of the Words import ſuch a Senſe, as is contrary to ſome evident Principle of Reaſon? then I won't believe it. How? not believe Scripture? No, no, I will believe no pretended Revelation, which contradicts the plain Dictates of Reaſon, which all Mankind agree in, and were I perſwaded, that thoſe Books, which we call the Holy Scriptures did ſo, I would not believe them; and this is a fairer and honeſter way, than to force them to ſpeak, what they never intended, and what every impartial Man, who reads them, muſt think was never intended, that we may believe them: To put our own ſenſe on Scripture, without reſpect to the uſe of Words, and to the Reaſon and Scope of the Text, is not to believe Scripture, but to make it; is not to learn from Scripture, but to teach it to ſpeak our Language; is not to ſubmit to the Authority of Scripture, but to make Scripture ſubmit to our Reaſon, even in ſuch Matters as are confeſſedly above Reaſon, as the infinite Nature and Eſſence of God is.

Though

Though I am never ſo well aſſured of the Divine Authority of any Book, yet I muſt expound it, as I do other Writings; for when God vouchſafes to ſpeak to us in our own Language, we muſt underſtand his Words juſt as we do, when they are ſpoke by Men: Indeed when I am ſure that it is an inſpired Writing, I lay it down for a Principle, that it contains nothing abſurd and contradictious, or repugnant to the received Principles of Natural Reaſon; but this does not give me Authority to Expound the Words of Scripture to any other ſenſe, than what they will naturally bear, to reconcile them with ſuch Notions, as I call Reaſon; for if one Man has this liberty, another may take it, and the Scripture will be tuned to every Man's private Conceits; and therefore in caſe the plain ſence of Scripture contradicts thoſe Notions I have of things, if it be poſſible to be true, I ſubmit to the Authority of Scripture; if it ſeems to include a Contradiction and Impoſſibility, if that Contradiction be not plain and notorious, and in ſuch Matters, as I am ſure, I perfectly underſtand, there I ſubmit again, and conclude it is no Contradiction, though I cannot comprehend how it is; if I can by no means reconcile it, I will confeſs, I do not underſtand it, and will not pretend to give any Senſe of it, much leſs to give ſuch a Senſe of it, as the Words will not bear.

This ſhows, that Men may pretend to expound Scripture according to Reaſon, when the Diſpute is nothing elſe, but *a Claſh of Reaſon with Scripture*, as this Author phraſes it: For ſo it is, when the uſual ſignification of the Words, and the Scope and Circumſtances of the Place require one Senſe, and Men force another Senſe on it, upon pretence of expounding

ng Scripture by Reaſon, that is, to reconcile Scripture to their pre-conceived Notions and Opinions of Things: for what the words ſignifie, that is the Senſe of Scripture; and when they will not admit this Senſe, becauſe they apprehend it contrary to Reaſon, though moſt agreeable to the Words and Scope of the Place, that is nothing elſe but a Controverſie between Scripture and Reaſon.

My preſent Undertaking does not oblige me to examine all the Scriptures, which are alledged by the *Socinians* againſt the Doctrine of the Trinity, or by others for it; this is a voluminous Work, and has often been done by others, and if there were any juſt Occaſion of doing it again, it deſerves a Treatiſe by it ſelf: but indeed it is the Doctrine it ſelf, which the *Socinians* diſlike, more than our Expoſitions, which they cannot deny to be reaſonable enough, were the Doctrine ſo; but they muſt not expound Scripture contrary to Reaſon, and therefore muſt never allow that the Scripture teaches ſuch a Doctrine, which they think contradicts the plain and ſelf evident Reaſon of Mankind; reconcile men to the Doctrine, and the Scripture is plain without any further Comment; this I have now endeavoured, and I believe our Adverſaries will talk more ſparingly of Abſurdities and Contradictions for the future, and then they will loſe the beſt Argument they have againſt the Orthodox Expoſitions of Scripture: but yet I am unwilling to diſmiſs this Argument, without ſome few Obſervations about the Senſe of Scripture.

This Author refers us to the Hiſtory of the *Unitarians*, which though it be but a little Book in all Senſes, is too large to be particularly examined now; but however I ſhall give ſome taſte of it. In the firſt

Letter the Author marshals those Texts, which he thinks overthrow the Doctrine of the Trinity, and because this may be most dangerous to unskilful Readers, I shall more particularly examine that. He reduces the Scriptures under several Topicks, or Heads of Arguments.

History of Unitarians, p.4,5. 1. *If our Lord Christ were himself God, there could be no Person greater than he, none that might be called his Head or God, none that could in any respect command him.* Now this Argument is fallacious, for though Christ be God himself, yet if there be Three Persons in the Godhead, the equality and sameness of Nature does not destroy the Subordination of Persons: a Son is equal to his Father by Nature, but inferiour to him as his Son: if the Father, as I have explained it, be Original Mind and Wisdom, the Son a personal, subsisting, but reflex Image of his Fathers Wisdom, though their Eternal Wisdom be equal and the same, yet the Original is superior to the Image, the Father to the Son: and therefore though I know such Texts as he alledges, *My Father is greater than I. The Head of Christ is God. I ascend to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God*; are both by Ancient and Modern Expositors applied to Christ's Human Nature; yet I see no Inconvenience in owning this to be true with respect to his Divine Person, and his Relation to his Father: For the Father is the Head and Fountain of the Deity, and the Son is God of God, and therefore the Father may be called his God.

14 John 28. 1 Cor. 11.5. 20 John 17.

12 John 49. 14.31. As for Christ's receiving Commands from the Father, though this relates to the Execution of his Mediatory Office, and so concerns him as God Incarnate,

as

as by the Diſpenſation of the Goſpel, he is the Miniſter of God's Will and Pleaſure, yet I grant even as God, he receives Commands from his Father, but it is no otherwiſe than as he receives his Nature from him: By Nature he is the Word, the Wiſdom, the Command of the Father; his reflex Image, whereby he produces all the Deſigns of his own Wiſdom, and Counſel into act. Thus St. *Auſtin* anſwered the *Arrian* Objection, That Chriſt was but God's Inſtrument, and made the World by God's Command. *Let them conſider with what other words the Father commanded his only Word. But they frame to themſelves an Imagination of two, near one another, but ſeparated by their diſtinct Places, one commanding, another obeying. Nor do they underſtand, that the Fathers Command it ſelf, that all things ſhould be made, is no other Word of the Father, but that by which all things are made*; that is, the ſubſtantial Word and Wiſdom, and Command of the Father, his only begotten Son.

Cogitent quibus aliis verbis juſſerit Pater unico verbo. Formant enim ſibi in phantaſmate cordis ſui, quaſi duos aliquos, etſi juxta invicem, in ſuis tamen locis conſtitutos, unum jubentem, alterum obtemperantem. Nec intelligunt ipſam juſſionem Patris ut fierent omnia, non eſſe niſi verbum Patris, per quod facta ſunt omnia. Aug. contr. Serm. Arianorum, Lib. 3.

2. *If our Lord Chriſt were indeed God, it could not, without blaſphemy, be (abſolutely and without Reſtriction) affirmed of him, that he is the Creature, the Poſſeſſion, the Servant, and Subject of God.* It is well he added, *abſolutely and without reſtriction*, but he had done better, if he had remembred it in his Proofs: that Chriſt is called a Creature, he proves, becauſe he is *the firſt-born of every Creature*, but here he ſhould have remembred his abſolutely and without reſtriction, for he is ſo the firſt-born of every Creature, that he is *the Image of the Inviſible God*, Page 5. 1 Col. 15.

and therefore no Creature; so born before all Creatures, as πρωτοτοκος also signifies, *That by him were all things created, that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth visible and invisible, whether they be Thrones, or Dominions, or Principalities, or Powers; all things were created by him and for him, and he is before all things,* (which is the Explication of πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, begotten before the whole Creation, and therefore no part of the Creation himself) *and by him all things consist,* τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκε, all things were not only made by him, but have their Subsistence in him; as the Apostle tells us, in God *we live, and move, and have our being*, that this does not relate to the new Creation, as the *Socinians* would have it, is very plain: For 1. in this sense Christ (if he were meer Man) was not the first-born of every new Creature; for I hope there were a great many new Creatures, that is, truly good and pious Men, before Christ was born of his Virgin Mother. 2. Nor in this sence were all things in Heaven and Earth visible and invisible, Thrones, Dominions, Principalities, and Powers, that is, all the Orders of Angels created by him: For the greatest part of visible things, (especially in the Apostles days, when so little part of the World was converted to the Christian Faith) were not new made by him; and none of the invisible things were new made by him: Good Angels did not need it, and he came not to convert fallen Angels, but to destroy the visible Kingdom of the Devil in this World, and to judge them in the next. 3. Nor in this sence were all things made *for him*; for he is a Mediator for God, to reduce Mankind to their Obedience and Subjection to him; and therefore when he has accomplished his Work of Mediation, and destroyed

1 Col. 17.

ſtroyed all Enemies, in the final Judgment of the World; he ſhall deliver up his Kingdom to his Father, that God may be all in all; of which more preſently.

4. And therefore the Apoſtle proceeds from his Creation of the Natural World, to his Mediatory Kingdom, which proves, that he did not ſpeak of that before: *And he is the Head of the Body the Church, who is the beginning, the firſt-born from the dead, that in all things he might have the preheminence:* As the Maker of all things viſible and inviſible, he is ſaid to be before all things, begotten of his Father before the Creation of the World; as Head of the Church, he is ἀρχὴ alſo, the beginning, the firſt who roſe from the dead, that he might be the πρωτεύων, the firſt upon all accounts; before the Worlds, and the firſt-born from the dead. That he was God's Miniſter and Servant, he proves by ſeveral Texts: As that he was *appointed* or *made* (which has the ſame ſenſe) *by God, the Apoſtle and High-Prieſt of our Profeſſion*: but here is *a reſtriction* to his being High Prieſt, and therefore no danger of Blaſphemy, though he be God: for we may obſerve, that though the Jewiſh High Prieſt were but a Man, yet he was a Type of a High-Prieſt, who is more than Man, even the Eternal Son and Word of God, as ſome of the Learned Jews acknowledge; for the Son of God is the only proper Mediator and Advocate with the Father, as *Philo Judæus* often calls the λόγος or Word, the ὁ ἀρχιερεύς or High-Prieſt; and ſhows that the Garments of the High-Prieſt were Figures of Heaven and Earth, which ſeems to ſignifie, that the Eternal Word, which made the World, is the true High-Prieſt. And the Story *Joſephus* tells of *Alexander* looks this way; that when *Jaddus* the High-Prieſt went out to meet him, dreſſed

Verſe 14.

Page 6.

3 Heb. 1, 2.

in

in all his Pontifical Attire, he approached him with great Reverence and Veneration, and his Captains wondering at it, he told them, That that God, who appeared to him, and sent him upon that Expedition, and promised him Victory and Success, appeared to him in that very Habit. I am sure the Apostle distinguishes Christ from *High-Priests taken from among men*; and makes his Sonship the Foundation of his Priesthood. *Christ glorified not himself to be made an High-Priest*, (which shows that it is no Servile Ministry) *but he that said unto him, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten Thee.* As he saith also in another place, *Thou art a Priest for ever after the Order of* Melchizedec. And what the Mystery of this *Melchizedecian* Priesthood was, he explains 7 *Hebrews*, that *Melchizedec* was *first by Interpretation King of Righteousness, and after that also, King of* Salem, *which is King of Peace, Without Father, without Mother, without Descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life, but made like unto the Son of God, which is a Priest continually.*

5 Hebr. 1.

5, 6.

7 Hebr. 2.3.

As for his next Quotation, that *Christ is Gods*, I know not what he means by it; for there is no doubt but Christ is God's Son, God's Christ, Gods High-Priest, serves the ends and designs of Gods Glory; and what then? therefore he is not God? By no means! he may conclude, that therefore he is not God the Father, because he acts subordinately, not that therefore he is not God the Son.

1 Cor. 3.23.

His next Proof is, that God calls him *his Servant* by the Prophet *Isaiah*; but it is his Servant *in whom his Soul is well-pleased*, which is the peculiar Character of his Son; and is that very testimony which God

12 Matth. 17. 18.

God gave to Chriſt at his Baptiſm by a voice from Heaven; *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleaſed.* 3 Matth. 17.

His next Proof is, that *he humbled himſelf, and became obedient*, which is all he cites; but what does he prove from this? that Obedience is part of his Humiliation? And what then? therefore he is not God? becauſe he voluntarily condeſcends below the Dignity of his Nature, does he forfeit the Dignity of his Nature? and yet this is the plain Caſe, as the Apoſtle tells us in that place: that He *being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made himſelf of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a Servant, and was made in the likeneſs of men, and being found in faſhion as a man, he humbled himſelf, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the Croſs.* And this is a wonderful Proof, that he is not God, becauſe *being in the form of God,* that is, being God, he voluntarily condeſcended to the meaneſt and moſt ſervile ſtate of Human Nature for the Salvation of ſinners. But the ſting of all is behind, that for this ſubmiſſion and obedience he was rewarded and exalted by God, and a God is not capable of a reward or exaltation, being Supreme himſelf, and yet as it follows, for this *God hath highly exalted him, and given him a Name above every Name.* 2 Phil. 8.9.

Now it ſeems very ſtrange to me, that Chriſt's advancement to the ſupreme Government of the World, ſhould be made an Argument againſt his being God, or the Eternal Son of God: for is it fitting and congruous for God to make a meer Creature the Univerſal Lord and Sovereign of the World? to advance a meer man above the moſt glorious Angels, to be the Head of all Principalities and Powers, which would be

be an Indignity to the Angelical Nature? is a meer Creature a fit Lieutenant or Repreſentative of God in Perſonal or Prerogative Acts of Government and Power? muſt not every Being be repreſented by one of his own Kind, a Man by a Man, an Angel by an Angel, in ſuch Acts as are proper to their Natures? and muſt not God then be repreſented by One, who is God? is any Creature capable of the Government of the world? does not this require infinite Wiſdom and infinite Power? and can God communicate infinite Wiſdom and infinite Power to a Creature, or a finite Nature? that is, can a Creature be made a true and eſſential God? if our Adorers of Reaſon can digeſt ſuch Contradictions as theſe, I hope they will never complain of Abſurdities and Contradictions more. A God without infinite Perfections, is only a Titular and Nominal God, and to ſay, that Creatures may have all the Perfections of God, is to ſay, that God can make an infinite Creature, which has a thouſand times greater Contradictions, than the moſt abſurd Explication of the Trinity can be charged with; for then a true and real God may be a Creature; then the Divine Nature is not eternal, but may be created? then the Divine Nature is not numerically One, but if the firſt God ſo pleaſed, he could make a world of Gods, as well as of Angels, or Men. If then this Kingdom to which Chriſt is advanced, cannot be adminiſtred without infinite Wiſdom and Power, then he is by Nature a God; for otherwiſe all Power in Heaven and Earth could not have been committed to him, becauſe he was not capable of it, could not adminiſter it: and would God chooſe a King, who could not adminiſter the Government of the World, nor do any thing towards it?

And

And yet the Difficulty remains; if he be by Nature the Son of God, and the Natural Lord of the World, how is he ſaid to be exalted by God, and to receive a Kingdom from him as the Reward of his Sufferings? when he was already poſſeſſed of it, ever ſince the Foundations of the World, being the Natural Lord of all Creatures; and therefore had no need to receive that which was his own, or purchaſe what was his Natural Right, by ſuch mean and vile Condeſcenſions, as ſuffering Death upon the Croſs.

And therefore rightly to underſtand this, we muſt conſider the Nature of Chriſt's Kingdom; that it is not meerly the Natural Government of the World, but a Mediatory Kingdom. God is the Supreme and Natural Lord of the World, King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, and the only Ruler of Princes: And while God governed the World only as its natural Lord, the Son had no diſtinct Kingdom of his own, but in Conjunction with his Father. For though there always were Three Divine Perſons in the Godhead, yet the Father being the Fountain of the Deity, the Government of the World was adminiſtred in his Name.

But Mankind quickly apoſtatized from God, forfeited immortal Life, corrupted their Manners, and defaced the Image of God upon their Souls; and then the Government of God conſidered only as our Maker and Soveraign Lord could give no hope nor ſecurity to guilty Sinners; and this made a Mediatory Kingdom neceſſary, to reconcile God and Men, and to reſtore Man to the Integrity of his Nature: and this Power and Dignity God beſtowed upon his own Son, who had the moſt right to it, and was beſt qualified for it, being the begotten Word and

Wiſdom of the Father: But he muſt firſt become Man, and publiſh the Will of God to the World, and make Expiation for Sin, and then he ſhould riſe again from the dead, and ſet down at the right hand of God.

And therefore we may obſerve, that all this Power Chriſt is inveſted with, is as Head of the Church.

1 Eph. 22, 23. *God hath put all things under his Feet, and given him to be Head over all things to the Church, which is his Body, the fulneſs of him, which filleth all in all.* That is, he has made him the Governour of the whole World, as Head of the Church. For the Salvation of Mankind required the Government of the World to be put into his Hands, that he might reſtrain the Power and Malice of wicked Spirits, and deſtroy the Kingdom of Darkneſs, and imploy good Angels in the Service and Miniſteries of his Church, as the

1 Heb. 14. Apoſtle tells us, *They are miniſtring Spirits, ſent forth to miniſter for them, who ſhall be Heirs of Salvation.* That the Government of this lower World might be adminiſtred by him with a peculiar regard and ſubſerviency to the great ends of his Spiritual Kingdom. For the Church of *Rome* is ſo far in the right, that the Supreme Head of the Church muſt be Supreme in Temporals too *in ordine ad ſpiritualia*; but their fault is, they give this Power to a vicarious Head, which is due only, and can be adminiſtred only by Chriſt, who is the true Supreme Head of all things to his Church.

The Government of *Iſrael* was a Type of this. The Kingdom of *Iſrael* was originally a pure Theocracy; God was their King, and governed them almoſt as viſibly by his Prieſts, his Oracles, his Judges, whom he extraordinarily raiſed up, as a Temporal King

King governs his Subjects. But in time they grew weary of the Government of God, and deſired a King like other Nations: upon which God tells *Samuel*, *They have not rejected thee, but rejected me, that I ſhould not reign over them.* 1 Sam. 8. 7. But yet he complies with their Deſires in giving them a King; and their King was peculiarly Gods Anointed, and God's King, who ruled God's People and Inheritance by Gods peculiar and delegated Authority: For the Government of *Iſrael* did not ceaſe to be a Theocracy, when they had a King; for they were God's People and Inheritance ſtill; but now the King was between God and the People, whereas God governed them more immediately before. And therefore as *David* was a Type of Chriſt, ſo his Kingdom was typical of the Kingdom of Chriſt; *Yet have I ſet my King upon my holy Hill of* Sion; which ſeems to have ſome aſpect on *David*; though it received its juſt Accompliſhment in Chriſt: and hence the Kingdom of the Meſſias is called *the Throne of his Father* David; not that Temporal Kingdom which *David* governed, for *his Kingdom was not of this World*; but that of which *David*'s Kingdom was a Type and Figure, the Government of the Church, who were God's People, of whom the carnal *Iſrael* was a Type, which he rules by a vicarious, but a Sovereign Authority, for God, and in his name and ſtead. This gives a plain account, how God may give this Kingdom to his Son, and that as the Reward of his Sufferings. It may be a Gift, becauſe it is not a Natural Right; for it is not a Natural Kingdom, but erected by the Wiſdom and Counſel of God, for the Salvation of Sinners; and it muſt be the Reward of his Sufferings, becauſe it is a Sacerdotal Kingdom, which is founded in the Expiation of his Blood. 2 Pſalm. 6. 1 Luke 32. 18 John 36.

And though Chriſt be the Eternal Son of God, and the Natural Lord and Heir of all things, yet *God hath* in this *highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name, that at* (or in ἐν) *the name of Jeſus every knee ſhall bow, of things in Heaven and things in Earth, and things under the Earth, and that every tongue*, (ſome of all Nations, Languages, and Tongues) *ſhall confeſs that Jeſus Chriſt is Lord to the glory of God the Father.* For when God exalts and magnifies himſelf, or exalts his Son, it does not, and cannot ſignifie any addition or increaſe of their eſſential Greatneſs and Glory, for neither the Father nor the Son can be greater than they are; but yet God is exalted, when his Greatneſs and Power is more viſible, and more univerſally acknowledged and adored: and thus God has highly exalted his Son too, by conferring the Mediatory Power and Kingdom on him; as to ſhew this particularly, but briefly.

This makes the Son more univerſally known, acknowledged, and adored. The Notion and Belief of one God is Natural to Mankind; that there are three Divine Perſons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, in the Unity of the Godhead, is not known by Nature, but by Revelation: There are ſome obſcure hints and intimations of this even in the Hiſtory of the Creation; more plain in the Types and Propheſies of the Jewiſh Law, which relate to the Meſſias; and poſſibly this was more particularly explained in their Cabala, which ſome learned men induſtriouſly prove contained this Myſtery of the Trinity: but all this while, this Myſtery was very obſcure, and the Glory of the Son little known in the World: for though now we certainly know from the Expoſition of Chriſt and

and his Apoſtles, that the Prophets ſpake of Chriſt under the name of Lord, and God, and Jehovah, yet all went in the Name of God. But when Chriſt appeared in the World, then God owned him for his Son; *this is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleaſed*; Chriſt owned himſelf for the Son of God, his only begotten Son: and upon all occaſions calls God his Father, and that in ſuch a diſtinguiſhing manner, that the Jews underſtood him to mean, that he was the Son of God by Nature, and charge him with Blaſphemy for making himſelf God. He appealed to thoſe mighty Works he did in his Father's Name, to prove the Truth of what he taught them, that he was indeed the Son of God.

3 Matth. . . .
3 John 16,17.
10 Joh. 29,30. 32,37,38.

But then God viſibly owned him for his Son, when he raiſed him from the dead, and beſtowed a Kingdom on him, a Name which is above every Name, as St. *Paul* tells us, *That he was declared to be the Son of God with power according to the Spirit of Holineſs, by the Reſurrection from the Dead.* And for this reaſon, that of the Pſalmiſt *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten Thee*, is applied to the Reſurrection of Chriſt from the Dead. *We deliver unto you glad tydings, how that the promiſe that was made to the Fathers, God hath fulfilled the ſame to us their Children, in that he hath raiſed up Jeſus again, as it is alſo written in the ſecond* Pſalm, *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten Thee.* Which it is plain does not ſignifie, that God then firſt begot him; for he owned him for his beloved Son long before, at his Baptiſm; and Chriſt calls himſelf his only begotten Son long before; and the *Socinians* themſelves attribute his Sonſhip to his miraculous Conception in the Womb of the Virgin; and St. *Paul*, we ſee, expounds

1 Rom. 5.
2 Pſal. 7.
13 Acts 32,33.

God's

God's begetting him at his Reſurrection, by his being declared the Son of God by the Reſurrection from the Dead, which ſuppoſes he was his Son before, and that not κατὰ σάρκα according to the Fleſh, for ſo he was the Seed of *David*, but κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσυνης according to the Spirit of Holineſs, or his Divine Nature, for ſo its oppoſition to κατὰ σάρκα proves it muſt ſignifie. He was the only begotten Son of God from eternal Ages, but the World did not fully know him to be ſo, till God declared this by his Reſurrection from the Dead, and by beſtowing a Kingdom on him; and then he viſibly appeared in the Glory and Majeſty of the Son of God, as if he had been begotten by him that day: and this ſeems to be the meaning of our Saviour's Prayer; 17 John 5. *And now, O Father, glorifie thou me with thine own ſelf, with that glory which I had with Thee, before the World was*; that is, now publickly own me to be thy Son, which I always was, but was never yet ſufficiently declared ſo to the World. And therefore when he was raiſed from the Dead, and advanced into his Kingdom which he was to adminiſter, not by Human Force and Power, but by the Power of the Divine Spirit, it was time to let the World know this great Myſtery of a Trinity in Unity, becauſe each Divine Perſon has his diſtinct and proper part in this myſterious œconomy: and therefore he commands his Diſciples to 28 Matth. 19. *Baptize in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt*, that is, into the belief and worſhip of One God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt: of which more preſently.

But this is not all; the Son is not only now made known and manifeſt to the World, and publickly owned by his Father, but he has a peculiar Authority inveſted

inveſted in him, diſtinct both from the Father and the Holy Spirit, as he is a Mediatory King.

There being but One Supreme and Sovereign God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, who are but One Energy and Power, but One Monarchy, but One Maker, and One Lord of the World; in the Natural Government of the World there is no diſtinction of the Divine Perſons, no peculiar Offices and Adminiſtrations to diſtinguiſh them; not One thing done by the Father, another by the Son, and a third by the Holy Ghoſt, but the whole Trinity made and governs the World by One individual Operation: and therefore the Creation and Government of the World is the Work of One God, and therefore peculiarly attributed to the Father, who is the Fountain of the Deity, who is that Original Mind and Wiſdom, who made, and who governs the World by his Son and holy Spirit; ſo that in the Natural Government of the World, the Son has no Kingdom of his own, but reigns as One Supreme God with the Father and the Holy Spirit, and all attributed to the Father as the beginning of Energy and Power.

But in the œconomy of man's Salvation, the Son has a Kingdom of his own, which is peculiarly his, adminiſtred in his Name, and by his Sovereign Authority. The Father is attoned by him, and has committed to him all Power both in Heaven and in Earth: 28 Matth. He is made the Head of all Principalities and Powers, which are now immediately ſubjected to him, and muſt receive their Commands and Orders from him; as the Apoſtle to the *Hebrews* tells us, *when God bringeth in the firſt begotten into the World*, that is, when God raiſed him up from the dead, and received him into Heaven, to ſit at his right hand; he ſaith, *and let all* 1 Hebr. 6.

the

the Angels of God worſhip him: obey his Commands, and be his Miniſters and Servants. The Holy Spirit is given by him, he ſends the Spirit to dwell in his Church, which is his Body, and to animate all the true and ſincere Members of it; He governs this lower World, diſpoſes of Kingdoms and Empires in ſubſerviency to the ends of his Spiritual Kingdom: He has the Power of pardoning ſins, of judging the World, of raiſing the dead; whom he pardons, God pardons; whom he condemns, God condemns; *for the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son.* Should the Father judge the World, he muſt judge as the Maker and Sovereign Lord of the World, by the ſtrict Rules of Righteouſneſs and Juſtice, and then how could any ſinner be ſaved? but he has committed Judgment to the Son, as a Mediatory King, who judges by the Equity and Chancery of the Goſpel.

The Power indeed whereby he adminiſters his Kingdom, is the Power of the whole Trinity, of Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt; for they being eſſentially One God, have but one Energy and Power, and therefore can never act ſeparately: and therefore the Reſurrection of Chriſt from the Dead is aſcribed to
2 Acts 24. God the Father, *God raiſed him from the dead*: to
13. 30. Chriſt himſelf, as he tells the Jews, *Deſtroy this Temple, and in Three days I will raiſe it up.* And, *I lay down*
2 John 19. *my life, that I may take it again, I have power to lay it*
10. 17, 18. *down, and I have power to take it again.* And to the Holy Spirit, *If the Spirit of him that raiſed up Chriſt from the dead dwell in you; he that raiſed up Chriſt from the dead, ſhall alſo quicken your mortal bodies by the Spirit that dwelleth in you.* Where God indeed
8 Rom. 11. is ſaid to raiſe up Chriſt from the dead, but it was by his

his Spirit, and by the ſame Spirit he will raiſe us.

But yet this is the Kingdom of Chriſt, becauſe now the Adminiſtration and Exerciſe of this Power is committed to him, and is as it were under his direction and influence. The Natural Kingdom and Government of the World is peculiarly attributed to God the Father, though the Son and Holy Ghoſt reign with him as One God: Becauſe the Father is Original Mind and Wiſdom, and therefore the beginning of all Power and Energy. As the Father begets the Son, not the Son the Father, and the Holy Ghoſt proceeds from Father and Son, not Father and Son from the Holy Ghoſt: ſo the Son and Holy Ghoſt will and act with the Father, not the Father with the Son and the Holy Ghoſt; that is, if we may ſo ſpeak where there is but One individual Act and Energy, the Father is the firſt Mover in the Sacred Trinity: For reflex Wiſdom, that is the Son, who is begotten Wiſdom, moves and acts, as it is begotten, by Original Mind and Wiſdom, who is the eternal Father, as Chriſt himſelf tells us; *The Son can do nothing of himſelf, but what he* 5 John 19. *ſeeth the Father do; for whatſoever things he doth, theſe alſo doth the Son likewiſe.* And *my Father worketh hi-* 17. *therto, and I work:* But the Father is the Principle and Beginning of Action; and therefore the Government and Monarchy muſt receive its Denomination from him; that it is the Kingdom of the Father.

But now in the Mediatory Kingdom, the exerciſe of the Divine Power is committed into the Hands of the Mediator, and is adminiſtred by the meaſures and terms of his Mediation. The Power is not taken out of God's Hands, for that is impoſſible; Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt govern the World ſtill by One

individual Act and Power, but as in the Natural Government of the World the Exercise of this Power begins with the Father, so in this Mediatory Kingdom it begins with the Son, and is directed by his Mediation; that is, God governs the World now, not meerly as a Natural Lord, by the Rules of Natural Justice, but with Respect to the Mediatory Power and Authority of his Son, and to serve the Ends of his Mediatory Kingdom.

Now *the Father judgeth no Man, but hath committed all Judgment to the Son*; He hath Power to save and to destroy; whom he pardons, God pardons; whom he condemns, God condemns; all Petitions are put up to God in his Name; all Blessings, both Temporal and Spiritual, are obtained from God in his
2 Phil. 9, 10, 11. Name; that is, it is the Name and Authority of Christ by which God now governs the World. This is the Name God has given him, *which is above every Name, that at the Name of Jesus every Knee should bow, both of things in Heaven, and things on Earth, and things under the Earth: And that every Tongue should confess, that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the Glory of God the Father.* That Angels in Heaven move at his Command, and obey his Power; that Men on Earth worship God, and expect all from him in his Name; that evil Spirits tremble at his Name, and yield to his Power; and that all the World confess the Supreme and Sovereign Authority of the Son, to the Glory of the Father, who hath thus highly exalted him.

There can be no other meaning but this, in what Christ tells his Disciples after his Resurrection from
28 Matth. 18. the dead; *All Power is given unto me both in Heaven and Earth.* For unless it be some Power, which he

he had not before as the Eternal Son of God, how can it be ſaid to be now given unto him? And yet before, in conjunction with, and ſubordination to his Father, he had all Power both in Heaven and Earth; but then this Power was not in his own Name, not ſeated immediately in himſelf, as his own Perſonal Authority; but now the Son is immediately inveſted with this Power and Authority as a Mediatory King.

And this is the meaning of what he tells us; *As the Father hath life in himſelf, ſo hath he given to the Son to have life in himſelf.* To have Life in himſelf, is to have the Power and Authority of beſtowing Life, as appears both from what goes before, and from what follows: *As the Father raiſeth up the dead and quickneth them, ſo the Son quickneth whom he will. Verily, verily, I ſay unto you, the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead ſhall hear the Voice of the Son of God, and they that hear ſhall live. Marvel not at this, for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the Graves ſhall hear his Voice, and ſhall come forth; they that have done good, to the Reſurrection of Life; and they that have done evil, unto the Reſurrection of Damnation.* This Power the Son always had, as begotten of his Father from all Eternity, and One God with him; but he here ſpeaks of a Perſonal Authority; which is given him as the Son of Man, as an Incarnate and Mediatory King; *And hath given him Authority to execute Judgment alſo, becauſe he is the Son of Man.* And therefore now it is given him to have Life in himſelf, *as* the Father hath Life in himſelf: The Father hath Life in himſelf, as the Original Fountain of all Life, by whom the Son himſelf lives; all Life is derived from God,

5 John 26.

21.

25.

28.

29.

27.

either by eternal Generation, or Proceſſion, or Creation; and thus Chriſt hath Life in himſelf alſo, in the new Creation he is the Fountain of Life; *he quickeneth whom he will; he is the bread of life, that came down from Heaven; if any man eat of this bread, he ſhall live for ever. As the living Father hath ſent me, and I live by the Father, ſo, he that eateth me, even he ſhall live by me. I am the Reſurrection and the Life; he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet ſhall he live; and whoſoever liveth and believeth in me, ſhall never die.* This is the Authority of his Mediatory Kingdom, which he hath received from his Father, that he hath Life in himſelf, and hath Authority and Power to give Life to the World.

6 John 57. 51. 57. 11 John 25. 26.

This is a Kingdom in a Kingdom, the Mediatory Kingdom of the Son in the Natural Kingdom of the Father, which reſtrains the Father's Juſtice, diſpenſes his Grace, and directs the Exerciſe of his Power in the Government of the World, which though it be upon theſe accounts a Superior Authority, and therefore a high Exaltation of the Son, yet it is no Diminution to the Father: *The confeſſing Jeſus Chriſt to be Lord, is to the glory of God the Father.*

1. Becauſe this Mediatory Kingdom is erected by the Father, and by the Father given to the Son; it is he, *who gave him this Authority, becauſe he is the Son of Man.* And therefore Chriſt every where owns, that he was ſent by God. *I am not come of my ſelf; I am come in my Father's Name. I proceeded forth, and came from God; neither came I of my ſelf, but he ſent me. I ſeek not my own will. I ſeek not my own glory. I came not to do my own will, but the will of him*

17 John 28. 5. 43. 5 John 30. 8. 42. 50. 12. 44. 6. 38.

him that ſent me. Which Scriptures make up the fourth Argument in the *Hiſtory of the* Unitarians againſt Chriſt's being God; *becauſe Almighty God doth* Page 8. *all things in his own Name, and by his own Authority*; but Chriſt comes in the Father's Name, and does his Will, and ſeeks his Glory. Which proves indeed, that he receives this Power from the Father, that he fulfils his Will, and ſerves his Glory in it, but if he receive this Kingdom, he has it, and a very glorious Kingdom it is, in ſome reſpects ſuperiour to the Natural Government of God, as it ſets bounds to it. But this only proves, that he is not the Father, but the Son, and the King of God; and this Authority being given him of the Father, to reduce Mankind to their Obedience, it is no leſſening of the Fathers Authority, from whom he receives this Mediatory Power.

2. This can be no Diminution to the Father, becauſe he is his only begotten Son; One God with himſelf, *the Brightneſs of his Glory, and the expreſs Image of his Perſon*, the Natural Heir of his Power and Greatneſs, and the Natural Lord of the World. As a Son, he is by Nature equal to his Father, but yet ſubordinate, and therefore cannot be his Rival; as a Son, his advancement is the Glory of the Father, *that* 5 John 23. *all men ſhould honour the Son, as they honour the Father*; and therefore it is no derogation to the Father, though he commit to the Son a more glorious Authority, than he exerciſes himſelf; the Authority of a Mediatory Kingdom, or Sovereign Grace, which is a more glorious Authority to Sinners, than Natural Juſtice and Dominion: For all Men know, a Son muſt receive all from his Father, and if the Father, for wiſe Reaſons, of which more preſently, give the Son

Son the more glorious Power, it is the Father, who is glorified in it: As he is God, the Eternal Son of God, and One with the Father, he is the proper Object of Religious Worſhip; and therefore all thoſe Divine Honours and Adorations, which are paid him, upon account of his Mediatory Kingdom and Power, are no Injury to the Divine Nature, as they would have been, had God conferred this Power on a Creature; which had been to give his Glory to another, which God deteſts, and declares his abhorrence of, and which all *Arians* and *Socinians* do, who worſhip Chriſt, believing him to be only a Creature, or a meer Man. The Command in Scripture to worſhip him, and pay Divine Honours to him, is a much better Argument to prove that he is God, than to juſtifie the worſhip of any Creature; which God univerſally prohibits, and is a much greater Contradiction to the Principles of Natural Religion, than a Trinity in Unity is to Natural Reaſon.

3. To this we muſt add, That his Kingdom is the Reward of his Obedience and Sufferings; that is, it is founded in the Expiation of his Blood: Is an Authority to diſpence that Grace and Mercy which he has purchaſed with his Blood: So that his Kingdom and Power is founded in the moſt perfect ſubmiſſion to his Father, is the Reward of his Obedience, whereby he glorified his Father on Earth; and therefore let his Power be never ſo great and glorious, his receiving it from God, as the Reward of his Obedience, ſecures the Prerogative and Glory of the Father.

4. Eſpecially when we add, That the Exerciſe and Adminiſtration of this Kingdom, is not by way of any direct

direct Authority and Power over God (which would neceſſarily eclipſe the Glory of the Father, and make him ſubject to the Son) but by way of Mediation and Interceſſion, as an Advocate and High-Prieſt. He firſt makes Atonement to God, and reconciles him to Sinners, does not command or over-rule, but propitiate the Divine Juſtice, and then exerciſes a Sovereign Authority in forgiving Sins, in deſtroying his Enemies, in governing Kingdoms and Empires, in ſubſerviency to his Spiritual Kingdom, and at the laſt Day in judging the World.

5. And therefore the time ſhall come, when Chriſt ſhall deliver up this Kingdom again to the Father: for it is not a Natural Kingdom, and therefore muſt not laſt always; no longer than till it has attained the ends for which it was erected: when Mankind are reduced into Obedience to God; when the Kingdom of the Devil is deſtroyed, and the Devil and his Angels, and all bad Men caſt into the Lake of Fire, which is the ſecond Death, and good Men raiſed out of their Graves, and rewarded with Eternal Life; that is, when Chriſt has accompliſhed the Work of his Mediation, that there is no longer any need of a Mediator, then the Mediatory Kingdom ceaſes. *Then cometh the end, when he ſhall have delivered up the Kingdom to God, even the Father, when he ſhall have put down all Rule, and all Authority and Power.* —— *And when all things ſhall be ſubdued unto him, then ſhall the Son alſo be ſubject unto him, that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.* That is, the Son ſhall no longer have a diſtinct Kingdom of his own, but ſhall return to his Natural Subordination to his Father, and reign with the Father and the Holy Spirit One

1 Cor. 15. 24.—28.

One God bleſſed for evermore: there ſhall no longer be any diſtinction between God and a Mediator, but God ſhall be all in all.

This is the beſt Account I can give of that Kingdom which the Son receives from the Father, and which he delivers up to the Father again; and theſe *Socinians* muſt think themſelves very great Wits, or the reſt of Mankind very great Fools, who hope to prove that Chriſt is not God, becauſe he received a Kingdom, when it is ſuch a Kingdom, as none but a God can receive or adminiſter. But to proceed:

Hiſtory Unit. p. 6, 7.

3. His next Argument is, That Chriſt is not God, becauſe *he is a Mediator between God and Men: A Prieſt that appeareth in the Preſence of God, and intercedeth with him for Men.* This he needed not have proved, becauſe all Chriſtians own it; only the *Socinians* make him a metaphorical Prieſt, which indeed is no Prieſt. But this I have anſwered already. He is a Prieſt after the Order of *Melchizedec*, King of *Salem*, and Prieſt of God; that is, he is a Sacerdotal King, and this Sacerdotal or Mediatory Kingdom proves him to be God, not a meer Creature-Advocate or Interceſſor.

4. His next Argument is, That he receives Authority from God, is ſent by God, came to do the Will of God: And this I have alſo already anſwered.

Page 8.

5. His next Argument conſiſts in applying ſuch things to the Divinity of our Saviour, as belong to

2 Luke 52.

his Humanity: That *he increaſed in Wiſdom* —— (he ſhould have added *Stature* too, but that had been ridiculous, becauſe it had diſcovered the fallacy, for

to

to be ſure *Stature* does not belong to a God) *and in favour with* God *and Men:* And why did he not add, that he was born, and was an Infant and Child, and by degrees grew up to be a Man? *that he knows not the Day of Judgment,* which he evidently ſpeaks of himſelf as Man; as all the ancient Fathers confeſs. In St. *Mark* it is ſaid, *But of that day, and that hour, knoweth no Man, no not the Angels that are in Heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.* St. *Matthew* does not mention the Son: *Of that day and hour knoweth no Man, not the Angels of Heaven, but my Father only.* Which ſhews that the Son in St. *Matthew* is included in the οὐδεὶς *none,* or no Man, and therefore concerns him only as a Man: For the Father includes the whole Trinity, and therefore includes the Son, who ſeeth whatever his Father doth. But of this more hereafter. That he knew not where *Lazarus* was laid, becauſe he asks, *Where have ye laid him?* And yet this very Jeſus knew without asking, at a diſtance, and ſome days before that *Lazarus* was dead; which would tempt one to gueſs, that he might know where they laid him too, though it was decent to ask. What his next Text referrs to I know not. For how the Father, being always preſent with him to confirm that teſtimony he gave of himſelf by miraculous Powers, proves that he is not God, I cannot tell: That he was tempted by the Devil, proves that he was a Man, but does not prove that he was not God: And that he would not be called *good* by thoſe, who thought him no more than a Man; or that he took this occaſion to inſtruct them, what an infinite diſtance there is between the eſſential Goodneſs of the Divine Nature, and the Goodneſs of Creatures, I think does not prove that he is not God.

13 Mark 32.

34 Matth. 36.

11 John 34.

8 John 16, 18.

18 Luke 19.

Page 10. 6. His ſixth Argument is to the ſame purpoſe; That *God giveth what and to whom he pleaſeth; he needs not the aid of any other; he entreateth not for himſelf and his People; he cannot die; and deriveth his Power from none but himſelf. But 'tis certain that the Lord Chriſt could not himſelf, without the prævious ordination of the Father, conferr the prime Dignities of Heaven or of the Church* (or any thing elſe, if he pleaſes, for he does nothing but what he ſees his Father do) *he placed his ſafety in his Fathers preſence and help: He prayed often and fervently to the Father, both for himſelf, and for his Diſciples. He died, and was raiſed from the dead by the Father. After his Reſurrection he received of another that great Power, which he now enjoyeth.*

Now all this we grant, and have anſwered already, which partly referrs to the œconomy of the Incarnation, and partly to his Natural Subordination to his Father. But to give a more full and plain Anſwer, and to prevent all ſuch Objections for the future, it will be neceſſary briefly to ſtate this Matter alſo.

Now this Author is certainly ſo far in the right, that the One Supreme God has all Authority and Power, can need no help from any other, can receive no Commands, no Power from another, has no need to pray to any other, to intercede for himſelf or others; can diſpoſe of all things, as he pleaſes, and to whom he pleaſes: Accordingly this One Supreme God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, receives no Power or Authority from any other Being, intercedes with no other Being, ſtands not in need of the help of any other, neither prays for himſelf or others to any other Being.

Well!

Well! but the Son prays to the Father, intercedes with the Father, receives Authority from the Father, diſpoſes of all things by his Father's Will. What then? then the Son is not the One Supreme God. Why ſo? He intercedes with no Creature, receives Authority from no Creature, *&c.* nor from any God neither ſeparated from himſelf, for he is One God with the Father and the Holy Ghoſt: that he intercedes with the Father, proves indeed that he is a diſtinct Perſon from the Father, not that he is not One God with him. If each Divine Perſon be God, none of them can intercede with, or receive Authority from any ſeparate Being, for then there muſt be ſome ſeparate God above them; and then they are not the Supreme God; but if there be Three diſtinct Divine Perſons in the Godhead, and an order and ſubordination between theſe Divine Perſons; I ſee nothing to hinder, why One Perſon may not intercede with another, and receive from another.

To ſhow the fallacy of this, I will frame another Argument exactly like it, which may do our *Socinians* a kindneſs in helping them to a new Argument, and who knows but that ſuch great Wits as they are may make it a good one: and it is this. The One Supreme God is not, and cannot be begotten of any other, nor proceed from any other, and therefore the Son who is begotten of the Father, is not the One Supreme God, and the Holy Ghoſt, who proceeds from Father and Son, is not the One Supreme God. The Major is as ſelf-evident as any Propoſition in *Euclide*; whoever underſtands the Terms, muſt confeſs it to be true, that the One Supreme God cannot be begotten, nor proceed from any other; the Minor is confeſſed by *Trinitarians*, that the Son is begotten of

the Father, and the Holy Ghoſt proceeds from Father and Son; how then ſhall we avoid the Concluſion, That the Son is not the One Supreme God, nor the Holy Ghoſt the One Supreme God? Indeed no way, that I know of, for the thing is true: the Son is not the One Supreme God, nor the Holy Ghoſt the One Supreme God, nay, nor the Father the One Supreme God, conſidered ſeparately from each other, but Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, or a Trinity in Unity is the One Supreme God: Now of this One Supreme God, it is certainly true, that he is not begotten, nor proceeds from any other; for then there muſt be a God above this One Supreme God: but if there be Three Perſons in this One Supreme God, this does not hinder, but the Father may beget the Son, and the Holy Spirit proceed from Father and Son, and yet the One Supreme God neither be begotten nor proceed; for it is not the One Supreme God, that is begotten, but the Divine Perſon of the Son, who is God, and with the Father and Holy Spirit, One Supreme God; nor is it the One Supreme God that proceeds, but the Divine Perſon of the Holy Ghoſt, who alſo is God, and together with Father and Son One Supreme God.

This is plain, and what every one may underſtand at firſt ſight; and the fallacy of the Argument conſiſts in this, That whatever may be affirmed of the One Supreme God is applied to each Divine Perſon in their Perſonal Capacities, as if each Perſon conſidered ſeparate from the other Divine Perſons, were the One Supreme God: Now this is falſe, for the One Supreme God is not any One Perſon diſtinct and ſeparate from the reſt, but all Three Perſons eſſentially united into One God; and therefore the Application muſt be falſe too; when what is true of the

One

One Supreme God, is applied to every diſtinct Perſon in the Godhead.

It is certain, the One Supreme God can neither be Father, Son, nor Holy Ghoſt: If he be a Father, he muſt beget a Son, who is not One with him, and yet is God: For the Son of God, who is begotten of his Father's Subſtance, and has the ſame Nature with him (which is the proper Notion of a begotten Son) muſt be God; as the Son of a Man is a Man: And if the Father himſelf in his own proper Perſon, as begetting the Son, be the One Supreme God, the whole entire Deity, then he muſt beget a Son without, not within himſelf, who is not, and cannot be that One Supreme God, that the Father is. The One Supreme God is One in himſelf, and ſeparate from all other Beings: And therefore if the One Supreme God be a Father, he muſt beget a Son ſeparate from himſelf; if he be a Son, he muſt have a Father ſeparate from himſelf; and ſo of the Holy Ghoſt.

In the One Supreme God, there may and muſt be a Trinity of Divine Perſons; within the Unity of the Godhead there is a Father, a Son, and a Holy Ghoſt, but the One Supreme God is neither; neither begets, nor is begotten, nor proceeds; for all Three Perſons are the One Supreme God, and what belongs to the Godhead, belongs to them all as conſidered in the Unity of the ſame Godhead, but not as conſidered in their diſtinct Perſonal Capacities, as One is the Father, the other the Son, and the third the Holy Spirit.

And thus it is in the preſent Caſe: The One Supreme God can no more be ſent, than he can be begotten, can receive no Commands from any other, cannot be given by any other; cannot be ſubject to any

any other Will but his own, *&c.* but the Divine Persons may ſend and be ſent, and intercede with each other; for though in the Unity of the Godhead they are all the One Supreme God, yet there is a mutual Relation and Subordination between the Divine Perſons, as I have already explained it.

As to inſtance in Interceſſion or Prayer for himſelf or others, which is a Contradiction to the Notion of a Supreme God, as it is to the Notion of an Abſolute and Sovereign Prince: But yet a Sovereign Prince may intercede with himſelf; his own Wiſdom, his own Mercy, Clemency, and Compaſſion, may intercede with him, and prevail too, without any diminution to his own Sovereign Power. Thus though the Supreme God can intercede with no other Being, yet the Son may intercede with the Father; his own eternal and begotten Wiſdom may intercede with him, and make Atonement and Expiation for ſinners: and thus God intercedes with no body but himſelf; for it is his own Wiſdom which intercedes with him, and makes the Atonement.

And if we will conſider things aright, we ſhall find that there can be no other Advocate with the Father but the Son, but his own eternal and begotten Wiſdom. When a man intetcedes with himſelf, it is done by reflecting on his own Mind, and examining the Reaſons and Motives he finds there to pity and ſpare, and to do good; that is by his reflex Wiſdom and Knowledge of himſelf, which in the Godhead is the Son, God's reflex Knowledge of himſelf, or his begotten Wiſdom, that Divine Λόγος or Word, which *Philo* calls the ἀρχιερεὺς or High Prieſt: For let us conſider, what it is to intercede with God, and what kind of Interceſſion is conſiſtent both with the Sovereign

raign Authority, and Sovereign Goodneſs of God. An infinitely wiſe, and juſt, and good Being cannot be moved by meer Entreaties, nor by the bare Intereſt and Favour of the Advocate; for this is weakneſs in Men, and therefore cannot be incident to the Divine Nature: Now if you ſet aſide Entreaties and Importunities and Favour, there can be no other Advocate with the Father, but his own Eternal Wiſdom. It is his own Wiſdom that muſt Atone him, that muſt reconcile him to Sinners, that muſt obtain Pardon and all other Bleſſings for them; for if this cannot be done wiſely, God cannot do it; and therefore his own Wiſdom muſt do all this; for no created Wiſdom can. But God loves his own Wiſdom, his only begotten Son, and therefore Wiſdom is a powerful Advocate, and muſt prevail with the Father. So that the Son's Interceſſion with the Father is ſo far from being incongruous, or inconſiſtent with his being God, that the Divine Nature can admit of no other Advocate or Interceſſor, properly ſo called. To intercede with a never-failing Effect and Succeſs, is an Act of Power and Authority, and for God to make a Creature-Advocate and Mediator, is to give a Creature Authority over himſelf, which cannot be; for it is a debaſement of the Divine Nature, and a reproach to the Divine Wiſdom, as if God did not better know, how to diſpoſe of his Grace and Mercy, than any Creature does. For Creatures to pray to God for themſelves or others, as humble Supplicants, is part of the Worſhip which Creatures owe to God; but to intercede with the Authority of a Mediator, is above the Nature and Order of Creatures; and God can no more give this to any Creature, than he can commit his own Soveraign Power and Authority

rity to them: But his own Eternal Wisdom can intercede with Authority; for Original Mind and Wisdom must yield to the Intercessions of his own Eternal Wisdom: which is not to submit to any Foreign Authority, but to his own. To proceed;

7. His next Argument to prove that Christ is not God, is this; That *Jesus Christ is in Holy Scripture always spoken of, as a distinct and different Person from God; and described to be the Son of God, and the Image of God.* This we own, and he has no need to prove it: And this is a wonderful Argument to convince those who acknowledge Three distinct Persons in the Godhead, to prove that Christ is not God, because he is a distinct Person from the Father; for so according to the Language of Scripture, *God* signifies *God the Father*, when he is distinguished from the Son and the Holy Spirit, as all Men grant: And to
Page 12. say, *'Tis as impossible that the Son or Image of the One true God should himself be that One true God, as that the Son should be the Father, and the Image that very thing whose Image it is,* is meer Sophistry; for if the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost be the One true God, they are the same One true God, and yet the Father is not the Son, nor the Son the Father.

Page 13. 8. His next Argument is, from *many Texts, which expresly declare that only the Father is God.* Now this I confess, would be a demonstration, could he produce any one Text, which asserts the Father only to be God, in opposition to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost; for then the Father must signifie the Person of the Father, in opposition to the Person of the Son, and to the Person of the Holy Ghost; but when the Father

Father is called the Only true God, only in oppoſition to all the falſe Gods, which the World then worſhipped; there *Father* does not ſignifie Perſonally, but that One Godhead or Divinity, of which the Father is the Source, and Fountain, and Original; he being that Eternal and Original Mind, which begets his own Image or Eternal Son, and from whom and the Son the Holy Spirit proceeds in the Unity of the ſame Godhead.

When the Father is ſaid to be the *only true God*, and the *One God*, that the Son and Holy Ghoſt are not hereby excluded from the Unity of the ſame Godhead, is evident from thoſe other Texts of Scripture, which plainly teach the Divinity of the Son and Holy Ghoſt; for if the Scripture teaches, that the Son is God, and the Holy Ghoſt God, it can never ſeparate the Father from his only begotten Son and Eternal Spirit; and therefore the Diſpute will iſſue here, Whether the Scripture does teach the Divinity of the Son and the Holy Spirit? 17 John 3. 1 Cor. 8.6.

When the Father is called the Only true God, it muſt be in oppoſition to all thoſe who were at that time worſhipped for Gods in the World, but were not true Gods, and therefore when Chriſt calls his Father the *only true God*, it could not be in contradiſtinction to himſelf and the Holy Spirit, for they were not then diſtinctly worſhipped. And when St. *Paul* calls the Father the *One God*, he expreſly oppoſes it to the many Gods of the Heathens. *For though there be that are called Gods, whether in Heaven* (the Sun, and Moon, and Planets, and deified Men) *or in the Earth* (the ſeveral Elements, Birds, Beaſts, *&c.*) (*as there be Gods many, and Lords many*) *but to us, there is but One God the Father, of whom are all things,*

and we in him; *and One Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him*; where the One God and One Lord and Mediator is opposed to the many Gods and many Lords or Mediators, which were worshipped by the Heathens.

These Texts indeed do plainly distinguish between the Father, and Christ: *This is Life eternal to know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.* And *to us there is but One God the Father, and One Lord Jesus Christ*; which is no more than what St. *Paul* teaches; *There is One God, and One Mediator between God and Men, the Man Christ Jesus.* The One God, and the One Mediator ought to be distinguished; for the whole Christian Religion, and the salvation of Sinners, depends upon this distinction; but this does not exclude Christ from being One God with the Father, though he have a distinct additional Glory of a Mediatory Kingdom.

I consider farther, when the Father is called the *One God*, and *the only true God*, it can be understood only of those, who are distinct and separated Gods from the Father, and are not One God with him; but it cannot exclude those, who are united in the Unity of the same Godhead; for they are but One God with the Father.

And this is plainly signified in the Title of the Father, and the Father of our Lord Jesus, which is God's peculiar Name under the Gospel, as the Maker of Heaven and Earth was before: For the Title of the Father does not exclude, but includes the Son; and therefore if it appears from Scripture, that this Son is true and real God, begotten of his Father from Eternity, the Son at least must be included in this Character of *the only true God.* His other Texts, which

which he cites under this Head, prove no more but that the Father of Christ is God, not that Christ is not One God with the Father. 1 Cor. 15. 24. 3 James 9. 15 Rom. 6.

9. He adds; *If Christ were indeed God, as well as Man, or (as* Trinitarians *speak) God the Son Incarnate in an Human Nature, it had been altogether superfluous to give the Holy Spirit to his said Human Nature as a Director and Guide; for what other help could that Nature need, which was One Person with (as they speak) God the Son, and in which God the Son did personally dwell.* Page 14.

Now the account of this is plain and short; for the whole Trinity is but One Energy and Power, and the Divine Persons cannot act separately *ad extra*; what the Father does, that the Son does, and that the Holy Ghost does by one individual Act, as I have shown at large; but the Sanctification of all Creatures (and such the Human Nature of Christ is) is peculiarly attributed to the Holy Spirit; and he might as well have asked, Why the Sanctification of the Church is ascribed to the Holy Spirit; for the Church is the Body of Christ, and Christ the Head from whence all Influences of Grace are derived into the Body; and though this be not a personal Union, it is next degree to it; for *we are Flesh of his Flesh, and Bone of his Bone:* And a Personal Union makes no difference in the manner of Operation, though it does in the Measures and Degrees: The Divine Word acts by and in conjunction with the Holy Spirit, and therefore sanctifies his own Human Nature, as he does his mystical Body the Church by the Operations and Influences of the Holy Ghost.

10. And this anſwers his next Argument, That the Miracles of Chriſt are attributed to the Holy Ghoſt, or to the Father dwelling in him: For Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt act together, as Chriſt tells us, *My Father worketh hitherto, and I work.*

Page 15. 11. His next Argument is; *Had our Lord been more than a Man, the Propheſies of the Old Teſtament in which he is promiſed, would not deſcribe him barely as the Seed of the Woman; the Seed of* Abraham; *a Prophet like unto* Moſes; *the Servant and Miſſionary of God, on whom God's Spirit ſhould reſt.* That our Saviour ought to have been thus deſcribed, though he had been more than a Man, is plain enough, becauſe he was to be all this: *The Seed of the Woman, the Seed of* Abraham, *a Prophet like unto* Moſes, but a much greater Prophet: *For* Moſes *was faithful in all his Houſe as a Servant, but Chriſt as a Son over his own Houſe.* But what he inſinuates, that he is *barely* thus deſcribed, ſhews, That this Author will never loſe a Cauſe by over-much Modeſty; for we with all the Chriſtian Church, and we have the Authority of Chriſt and his Apoſtles for it too, ſay, That he is deſcribed in the Old Teſtament alſo, not only as the Seed of *Abraham*, but as the Son of God. Of which more preſently.

3 Hebr. 5, 6.

His next Attempt is againſt the Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt, but here is little that requires a diſtinct Anſwer, it being only the Repetition of his old Fallacies.

Page 16. 1. That *the Holy Ghoſt or Spirit, and the Power of God, are ſpoken of as one and the ſame thing.* And what then? His intended Concluſion, I ſuppoſe, is that

that the Holy Ghoſt is not a Perſon, which is the Intention of his ſecond Argument; but this is ſo novel and ridiculous a Conceit, (too ſenſleſs for any of the ancient Hereticks) that it ought not to be ſeriouſly confuted, but deſpiſed: For it is as eaſie to prove the Father and the Son to be no Perſons, as the Holy Spirit. He is the Spirit of God, which ſearcheth the deep things of God, and he who knows all that is in God, is a knowing Mind: But to dream of Power and Inſpiration in God, diſtinct as he confeſſes from God, and no Perſon; is to attribute ſuch Powers and Faculties to an infinite Mind, as there are in created Minds; to compound God of Mind and Intellectual Powers and Faculties, which all Men of ſenſe have ſcorned the thoughts of: What are Faculties in us, are Perſons in God, or elſe God is not a pure and ſimple Act, as I ſhewed above. Which ſhews the vanity of his Pretence, That *the Holy Spirit is ſpoken of as a Perſon, by the ſame Figure of Speech that Charity is deſcribed as a Perſon*, 1 Cor. 13. 4, 5. *and Wiſdom*, 9. Prov. 11. For theſe natural or acquired Powers and Habits are ſaid to do that which the Perſon who has them, and acts by them, does: As *Charity ſuffereth long, and is kind*, becauſe a charitable Man does ſo, *&c.* And if we may allow ſuch Habits and Powers in God, the Caſe may be ſomewhat parallel; for when we have compounded God of Subſtance or Eſſence, or Faculties or Powers, we may then find figurative Perſons in God, as there are in Men. Page 18.

This is certain, all Perſonal Acts belong to a Perſon, and therefore whatever has any Perſonal Acts aſcribed to it, we muſt conclude is a Perſon, unleſs we know by ſome other means, that it is no Perſon, and then that proves the Expreſſion to be figurative.

Thus

Thus we know Charity is no Perſon, but a Grace or Vertue, and therefore when Perſonal Acts are attributed to Charity, as to ſuffer long, and be kind, *&c.* We know this is a Figure; but it is ridiculous hence to conclude, That the Holy Ghoſt, who has Perſonal Acts aſcribed to him, to work Miracles, to raiſe the Dead, to comfort, to convince, to ſanctifie the Church, to dwell in the Church, as in his Temple, *&c.* is yet no Perſon, becauſe Charity, which we know to be no Perſon, has Perſonal Acts aſcribed to it: Which is as much as to ſay, That becauſe Perſonal Acts are ſometimes uſed figuratively, therefore they muſt never be properly expounded; whereas on the other hand, we muſt never expound any thing figuratively, but where the ſubject will not admit of a proper ſenſe. If it were as known and certain, that the Holy Ghoſt is no Perſon, as that Charity is none, then there would be reaſon to allow a Figure; but to prove that the Holy Ghoſt is no Perſon, only becauſe Perſonal Acts are ſometimes figuratively attributed to that which is no Perſon, is a Maxim only in the *Socinian* Logick, which is nothing elſe but a Syſtem of abſurd and ridiculous Fallacies.

2. His ſecond Argument againſt the Spirit's being God, is this; *A manifeſt diſtinction is made, as between God and Chriſt, ſo alſo between God and the Holy Spirit, or Power and Inſpiration of God; ſo that 'tis impoſſible the Spirit ſhould be God himſelf.* This has been anſwered already, as to the diſtinction between God and Chriſt, and the ſame Anſwer will ſerve for the Holy Spirit. But this Confeſſion of the *Socinian* confutes his whole Hypotheſis, and proves the Holy Spirit to be a Perſon, and God.

He

He ſays the Holy Spirit is diſtinct from God, ſo diſtinct that 'tis impoſſible he ſhould be God himſelf; then ſay I, this Holy Spirit is either a Divine ſubſiſting Perſon, or nothing but a Name. If this Spirit were a Divine Vertue and Power, as he would have it, then it is not diſtinct from God, but is God himſelf, as the Powers and Faculties of the Mind, though they may be diſtinguiſhed from each other, yet they can't be any thing diſtinct from the Mind, but are the Mind it ſelf; and therefore if the Spirit, as he ſays, be repreſented in Scripture, as ſo diſtinct from God, that 'tis impoſſible he ſhould be God himſelf, then he muſt be a diſtinct Divine Perſon, and not the meer Power of God, which is not diſtinct from God himſelf.

If the Spirit be diſtinct from God, and not God himſelf, and yet have Perſonal Acts aſcribed to him, then he muſt be a diſtinct Perſon; for Faculties, Vertues, and Powers, have Perſonal Acts and Offices aſcribed to them, only upon account of their Unity and Sameneſs with the Mind in which they are, which is a Perſon, and acts by theſe Powers; but a Power which is diſtinct from God, and is not God himſelf, (as he ſays the Holy Spirit is) if it have any Perſonal Acts, muſt be a diſtinct Perſon; and if theſe Perſonal Acts are ſuch, as are proper only to God, it muſt be a diſtinct Divine Perſon.

He ſays, this Holy Spirit is the Inſpiration of God; be it ſo: This Inſpiration then is either within God himſelf, or without him, in Creatures, who have this Inſpiration. If it be within God himſelf, it muſt be a Perſon, or elſe it cannot be diſtinct from God; and a Divine Perſon unleſs any thing be in God, which is not God. If this Inſpiration be without God, in Creatures,

tures, who are inſpired by him; how is it the Spirit of God? For the Spirit of God muſt be in God, as the Spirit of Man is in Man: How does this Inſpiration in Creatures *ſearch all things, yea the deep things of God? and knoweth the things of God, as the Spirit of a Man knoweth the things of a Man?* For the Inſpiration in Creatures ſearcheth nothing of God, and knoweth nothing of God, but what God is pleaſed to reveal. The Inſpiration knows nothing of God, but the inſpired Mind knows as much, as it is inſpired with the knowledge of. So that according to this Account, the Spirit of God is nothing but the inſpired knowledge in Creatures; and therefore no Perſonal Acts can be attributed to it, but what Creatures can do by ſuch Inſpiration; and let any Man conſider, whether this anſwers thoſe Characters we have of the Spirit of God in Scripture.

1 Cor. 2. 10, 11.

If this be ſo, I deſire to know, How the Spirit of God differs from his Gifts and Graces? For if the Spirit be nothing but God's Inſpiration in Creatures, the Spirit is either a Gift or a Grace, and is not One in All, but as many as thoſe Creatures are, that are inſpired; and as different as the Gifts and Graces are, with which they are inſpired: Whereas St. *Paul* tells us, *There are Diverſities of Gifts, but the ſame Spirit; and there are differences of Adminiſtrations, but the ſame Lord, and there are diverſities of Operations, but it is the ſame God, which worketh all in all.* So that the Spirit is diſtinguiſhed from his Gifts, as the Lord is from his Adminiſtrations, and God from his Operations; and is the ſame Spirit in all, as it is the ſame Lord, and the ſame God.

1 Cor. 12. 4, 5, 6.

3. His

3. His next Argument is, *The Spirit is obtained for us of God by our Prayers; therefore it ſelf is not God.* But this has been anſwered already; for though the One Supreme God cannot be ſent, nor given (which I ſuppoſe is the force of his Argument) yet in the ever bleſſed Trinity, One Divine Perſon may ſend and give another; the Father may ſend the Son, and give the Holy Spirit. And yet ſince they like that better, we will allow, *That the Holy Spirit does give himſelf, and is asked of himſelf*; for the Divine Perſons in the Trinity, as I have often obſerved and proved, do not act ſeparately, but as the Father and the Son give the Holy Spirit, ſo the Holy Spirit gives himſelf in the ſame individual Act.

And when we pray to God for his Holy Spirit, we pray to Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, who are this One God, and One entire object of Worſhip: It is the ever bleſſed Trinity we invoke, when we pray *Our Father which art in Heaven.* For as they are inſeparably One God, ſo they are the inſeparable Object of our Worſhip: ſince this great Myſtery of a Trinity in Unity is ſo plainly revealed to us, we cannot worſhip this One Supreme God, but we muſt direct our Worſhip to all Three Divine Perſons in the Unity of the ſame Godhead; for we do not worſhip this One Supreme God, unleſs we worſhip Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt: And therefore whether we invoke each Perſon diſtinctly, as our Church does in the beginning of the Litany; or pray only to God by the Name of the moſt High God, or by the Name of Father, or the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, it is all one; for Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt is the One Supreme God, and the entire object of our Worſhip: And whoever worſhips One God, but not Father, Son,

and Holy Ghoſt, does not worſhip the true God, not the God of the Chriſtians. Before this was ſo plainly revealed, it was ſufficient to worſhip One Supreme God, without any conception of the diſtinct Perſons in the Godhead; but when it is plainly revealed to us, that this One Supreme God is Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, whoever does not worſhip Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, does not worſhip the true God; for the true God is Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, and there is no God beſides him: which I would deſire our *Unitarians* (as they falſly call themſelves) and our *Deiſts* carefully to conſider: If any thing be fundamental in Religion, it is the worſhip of the One true God; and if Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt be this One true God, thoſe who worſhip a God, who is not Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, do not worſhip the true God, and that I think is the true Notion of Idolatry. So that theſe Men are ſo far from being Chriſtians, that I cannot ſee, how they are worſhippers of the true God; which ſhould at leaſt make them concerned to examine this matter with more Care and leſs Prejudice than they have yet done.

So that when we worſhip One God, we worſhip Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, and when the Glory of theſe Divine Perſons was made known to the World, there was no need of any new Command to worſhip theſe Three Divine Perſons; for when it is revealed, that they are the One Eternal God, the Command of worſhipping this One God muſt include them all. Which gives a ſufficient Anſwer to what he adds, That *there is neither Precept nor Example in all Holy Scripture, of Prayer made to the Spirit, on this or any other occaſion: Which on the Trinitarian Suppoſition, that the Holy Spirit is a Perſon and God, no leſs than the*

the Father, is very ſurprizing, nay utterly unaccountable. But I hope this will ſatisfie any man, that it is not unaccountable; for though the Spirit be God, he is but One God, with Father, and Son, and therefore not a diſtinct and ſeparate Object of Worſhip, but is worſhipped with the Father and the Son, in the Unity of the ſame Godhead, and this required no new Command, nor any ſeparate worſhip of the Holy Spirit.

There is indeed a diſtinct worſhip paid to Chriſt; *All men muſt honour the Son, as they honour the Father.* When God brought *his firſt begotten into the World*, that is, when he raiſed him from the Dead, and exalted him to his own right hand, *he ſaid, and let all the* 1 Hebr. 6. *Angels of God worſhip him: God hath highly exalted him, and given him a Name, which is above every Name, that at the Name of Jeſus every Knee ſhould* 3 Phil. 10, 11. *bow, of things in Heaven, and things in Earth, and things under the Earth.* But this is not meerly as he is the Son of God, the ſecond Perſon in the Trinity, for ſo he is worſhipped as One God with the Father and the Holy Ghoſt; but as he is a Mediator or a Mediatory King; as he has a Kingdom diſtinct from the Natural Kingdom of the Father, as I have already ſhown, ſo there is a worſhip proper to him as Mediator; but the Holy Spirit has no diſtinct Kingdom, and therefore no diſtinct Worſhip, but is worſhipped in the Unity of the Godhead, and this required no new Command; for he who knows, that Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt are One Supreme God, muſt worſhip Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt as One Supreme God.

4. His next Argument is againſt a Trinity of Per-

Page 19. ſons in the Godhead, which, he ſays, is *contrary to the whole Scripture, which ſpeaks of God but as One Perſon, and ſpeaks of him, and to him, by ſingular Pronouns, ſuch as I, Thou, me, Him.*

His Proofs that the Scripture ſpeaks of God *as but One Perſon*, are very wonderful. His firſt is, that of
13 Job 7,8. *Job*, ; *Will we ſpeak wickedly for God? and talk deceitfully for him? Will ye accept his Perſon? will ye contend for God?* But ſurely to accept God's *Perſon*, no more ſignifies the Perſonality of the Godhead, than to accept the Perſon of a Man, ſignifies his Human Perſon: the Hebrew is *his Face*, which is far from ſignifying a Perſon in the ſenſe we ſay, there are Three Perſons in the Godhead. To reſpect the Perſon of a Man is to do ſomething for him, which neither Law, nor Juſtice, nor Equity required ; not becauſe he is a Perſon, which every Man is, but from ſome partial reſpect we have to his particular Perſon ; and therefore to accept *the Perſon of God* here ſignifies *to ſpeak wickedly for God* ; which is an abſurd and ſenſleſs thing, as *Job* repreſents it, whether the Supreme God be One Perſon, or Three ; for in this ſenſe of Perſon, One God can be but One Perſon.

1 Hebr. 1,2. The other Text that Chriſt is the expreſs Image of God's Perſon, is as little to the purpoſe ; for it is plain, the Perſon of whom the Son is the expreſs Image, is the Perſon of God the Father ; and the Father indeed is but One Perſon.

As for his ſingular Pronouns, they prove indeed that there is but One God, as we all own, not that there are not Three Perſons in the Godhead. For when the Scripture ſpeaks of God without any particular reſpect to the diſtinction of the Perſons, it muſt ſpeak but of One God, becauſe God is but One, and ſingu-

ſingular Pronouns are moſt properly applied to One God. As for what he objects, That *no Inſtance can be given in any Language of Three Perſons whoever ſpoke of themſelves, or were ſpoken to, by the ſingular Pronouns, I, Thou, Me, Him, Thee*; it were ſufficient to anſwer, That there is no other Example in Nature neither, of Three Perſons who are eſſentially One; and if the manner of ſpeaking muſt be conformed to the Nature of Things, there can be no other Inſtance of this way of ſpeaking, becauſe there is no other Example of this Unity; but all Languages ſpeak of One in the ſingular Number, and ſo the Scripture uſes ſingular Pronouns of One God. But this is not the Caſe; for when God ſpeaks of himſelf, he does not ſpeak of himſelf, as Three Perſons, but as One God, and therefore may ſay *I* and *Me*: And when the Prophets ſpeak of God, or pray to him, they pray to him as One God, and therefore may ſay, Thou, and Him, and Thee. When Three Perſons are One God, God may ſpeak of himſelf, or we may ſpeak of, or to God, either conſidered as Three Perſons, or as One God; and though Three Perſons require the Plural Number, yet One God may ſpeak of himſelf, or be ſpoken to, by ſingular Pronouns. Page 20.

5. He ſays, *Had the Son or Holy Ghoſt been God, this would not have been omitted in the Apoſtles Creed.* And I ſay, Had not the Son been God, and the Holy Ghoſt God, they would not have been put into the Apoſtles Creed, no more than into the form of Baptiſm, which is the original of the Apoſtles Creed. That the Primitive Chriſtians did believe the Divinity of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt, we are ſufficiently aſſured from all the ancient Records of their Faith; but there was no reaſon to expreſs this in ſo ſhort a Creed, before the *Arian* Page 22.

and

and *Socinian* Hereſies had diſturbed the Church; and indeed there was no need of it, for the only Son of God muſt be by Nature God, and the Spirit of God is as eſſentially God, as the Spirit of a Man is eſſential to a Man.

Page 24. He concludes, That *theirs* (the *Socinians*) *is an accountable and reaſonable Faith; but that of the* Trinitarians *is abſurd, and contrary both to Reaſon and to it ſelf, and therefore not only falſe, but impoſſible.* The Faith of a Trinity in Unity, I hope, I have ſufficiently vindicated already from Abſurdity and Contradiction. But it will be worth the while briefly to conſider, how accountable and reaſonable the *Socinian* Faith is.

The *Socinian* Doctrine is, That Chriſt, who is called the Son, the only begotten Son of God, the Brightneſs of his Glory, and the expreſs Image of his Perſon, is no more than a meer Man, who had no Being, till he was Conceived in the Womb of the Virgin *Mary*, and is called the Son of God, becauſe God formed him by an immediate Power in the Virgins Womb, and raiſed him from the Dead, and exalted him to his own right hand in Heaven; and that the Holy Spirit is only the Power and Inſpiration of God, that is, is either God himſelf, or the Operation of his Power in Creatures.

This is their accountable and reaſonable Doctrine, and to ſhow how very accountable and reaſonable it is, I come now to draw up my charge againſt it.

1. That it ridicules the Scriptures. 2. That it ridicules the whole Jewiſh Oeconomy. 3. That it ridicules the Chriſtian Religion. 4. That it juſtifies, or at leaſt excuſes both Pagan and Popiſh Idolatries.

The

The Charge is full enough, and I am contented it ſhould paſs only for big huffing words, till I have proved it; and then I hope, it may paſs for a juſt Return to the ridiculous Blaſphemies of the *Brief Notes*, and *Brief Hiſtory*.

1. That it ridicules the Scripture, by putting either an abſurd, or a very mean trifling ſenſe on it, unworthy of the Wiſdom of God, by whom it was inſpired; and this I ſhall give ſome inſtances of, in their Expoſitions of Scripture, which I find in the Brief Hiſtory of the *Unitarians*.

In the ſecond Letter he takes notice of ſome Texts in the Old Teſtament, which ſpeak of God, and in the New Teſtament are applied to Chriſt, which we think a very good Argument to prove, That Chriſt is that God, to whom thoſe Texts belong in the Old Teſtament; for though poſſibly without ſuch an Application we could not certainly have known, that theſe Texts were ſpoken of Chriſt, yet the Authority of Chriſt and his Apoſtles who have made this Application, is as good a Reaſon to believe, that they were meant of Chriſt, as to believe any other part of the Goſpel: Let us then conſider, how he anſwers ſuch Texts.

What the *Pſalmiſt* ſays, *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever, a Scepter of Righteouſneſs is the Scepter of thy Kingdom. Thou haſt loved Righteouſneſs, and hated Iniquity, therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed Thee with the Oyl of Gladneſs above thy Fellows*; the Apoſtle to the *Hebrews* applies to Chriſt; *But unto the Son he ſaith, Thy Throne, O God*, &c. To this he Anſwers, *In the Hebrew, and in the Greek, 'tis God is thy Throne* (i.e. *thy ſeat, reſting place, eſtabliſhment*) Page 4. 5. 45 Pſalm 6, 7. 1 Heb. 8. 9.

bliſhment) *for ever*; If he had only ſaid, *it may be ſo*, he had ſaid right; but it is falſe, to ſay, it is ſo. For the Hebrew *Elohim* may be either the Nominative or the Vocative Caſe, and ſo the Greek ὁ Θεὸς, which is an Attick Vocative, and ſo is uſed by the *Septuagint*, 22 *Pſalm* 1. Ὁ Θεὸς μου, ὁ Θεὸς μου, *My God, my God, why haſt thou forſaken me.* And it is evident, the *Septuagint*, the *Vulgar Latin*, the *Chaldee Paraphraſe*, the *Syriack* and *Arabick Verſions*, took it for the Vocative Caſe, and thus the Chriſtian Church has always underſtood it; and this is the moſt natural Conſtruction, when it immediately follows a Pronoun, which has no other immediate Relative; *Thy Throne, O God*, that is, *O God, thy Throne is for ever and ever.* And thus the Apoſtle muſt underſtand it; *To the Son he ſaith, Thy Throne, O God:* where, *O God*, muſt be referred to the *Son*, and *thy* to *God:* And the ſence he gives of it, is abſurd, and what we have no Example of in Scripture, that *God is a Throne*: God indeed is
18 Pſalm 2. called *a Rock, a Fortreſs, a high Tower*, which is expounded by a *Deliverer*; but *a Throne* here ſignifies *a Kingdom*, as is evident from the following Words; and to ſay, that God is *the Throne*, and *the Kingdom* of Chriſt, is to ſubject the Father to the Son; for a King ſits upon his Throne, and governs his Kingdom.

The Apoſtle in the next Verſe cites another glorious Teſtimony which God hath given to his Son; *And,*
102 Pſalm 25, 26, 27. *Thou Lord in the beginning haſt laid the Foundations of the Earth, and the Heavens are the work of thine hands; they ſhall periſh, but thou remaineſt; and they all ſhall wax old as doth a Garment, and as a Veſture ſhalt thou fold them up, and they ſhall be changed; but thou art the ſame, and thy years ſhall not fail.* This

is

is ſo plain a Teſtimony to the Divinity of our Saviour, if theſe words be allowed to be applied by the Apoſtle to Chriſt, that our Author is forced to deny it. He ſays, *The Context has this ſenſe, And thou Lord, (that* Page 50. *is, and in another Text of the* Pſalms, *it is ſaid, Thou Lord,)* which is certainly true, if he had added but one word more, *viz. to the Son. And in another Text of the* Pſalms, *it is ſaid to the Son, And thou Lord haſt laid the Foundations of the Earth*; for ſo the Context requires us to ſupply it, if we will make ſenſe of it; for the Apoſtle obſerves in what different Language God ſpeaks of the Angels, and to the Son: *Of the Angels*, he ſaith, *who maketh his Angels Spirits, and his Miniſters a flaming Fire*; *but to the Son*, he ſaith, *thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever.*—— *And to the Son*, he ſaith, *Thou Lord in the beginning haſt laid the Foundations of the Earth.* ——— *But to which of the Angels ſaid he at any time, Sit on my right hand until I make thine Enemies thy Footſtool.* This is eaſie and natural; but to apply thoſe words to the Father, *Thou Lord in the beginning haſt laid the Foundations of the Earth*, &c. is to break the whole Context, is contrary to the Apoſtles deſign, and no good ſenſe can be made of it; and this I think is to ridicule Scripture, to make it Nonſenſe, or very bad, diſturbed, and incoherent ſenſe, when there is no need of it, but to ſerve an Hypotheſis, which the Text was deſigned to confute. He ſays, *Tho. Aquinas rightly acknowledged, that the words of both theſe Texts may be underſtood of God only, not of Chriſt*; but this is falſe (as indeed he ſeldom cites any Author, but he corrupts him) for *Thomas* ſays, *this Text may be underſtood of either*; but if you underſtand it of the Father, then by *in the beginning* you muſt underſtand the Son, who, he ſays,

is called *the beginning: Thou Lord in the beginning*; that is, in or by the Son, *haſt laid the Foundations of the Earth*; for he ſaw the Context required, that theſe words ſhould be applied to Chriſt, but he thought it indifferent, whether they were applied to him in whole or in part, ſince both ways he is made the Creator of the World, which anſwers the Apoſtles deſign; and though I think *Thomas* was miſtaken, yet this makes nothing to our Author's purpoſe.

68. Pſalm 18. 4. Eph. 8. Thus what the *Pſalmiſt* ſays of God, *Thou haſt aſcended on high, thou haſt led captivity captive, thou haſt received Gifts for Men*; St. *Paul* attributes to Chriſt. Here our Hiſtorian ſpends a great many words to no purpoſe, about Chriſt's deſcent into the Grave and into Hell, and his aſcending into Heaven to fill all things; or, as he ſays, it might be better rendred *to fulfil all things*; that is, *all the Propheſies of himſelf, and others concerning his Death, and Aſcenſion into the higheſt Heavens:* But how does τὰ πάντα ſignifie all Propheſies, or how does his Aſcenſion into Heaven fulfil all Propheſies? As *for the Gifts given to men*, he ſays, *in the* Pſalms, *they are literally meant of God, and of Chriſt, only by way of Propheſie, or rather of Emblem, or Accommodation*; which he learnedly proves, becauſe *the Gifts* the Apoſtle ſpeaks of, *were not given or received till about One thouſand Years after* David's *time.*

Now what of all this? we readily grant, that aſcending on high, the leading Captivity captive, the receiving Gifts for Men, which the *Pſalmiſt* ſpeaks of, were not the ſame, with the Aſcenſion of Chriſt into Heaven, his leading Captivity captive, and giving Gifts to Men, but were Types and Figures of it; but the ſingle Queſtion is, whether Chriſt be that God,

of

of whom the *Pſalmiſt* ſays, that *he aſcended on high*, &c. If he be not, St. *Paul* has abus'd us, for he applies that to Chriſt, which was not ſaid of him; if he be, we have what we deſire, that Chriſt is God: but this, which was the only Queſtion, he ſays not one word to. Men may be Types and Figures, as *David* and others were of Chriſt; and in this caſe, what was ſaid of *David*, as a Typical Perſon, may be applied to the Perſon of Chriſt: but God himſelf can be no Type, for the Type is always leſs perfect than the Antitype; and therefore whatever is ſaid of God, muſt belong to his Perſon, and cannot belong to any other. What God did under the typical ſtate of the Law, may be a Type and Figure of thoſe more glorious things, which we would do in Human Nature; and thus his Triumphs and Victories over the Enemies of his Church, which is by a Metaphor called his aſcending on high, (ſince God, who fills all places, neither locally aſcends nor deſcends) was a Type and Figure of his real Aſcenſion into Heaven, after he had firſt deſcended into the lowermoſt parts of the Earth, as the Apoſtle argues; but if what the *Pſalmiſt* ſays, that God aſcended on high, *&c.* received its accompliſhment in the Aſcenſion of Chriſt into Heaven, Chriſt muſt be the God of whom the *Pſalmiſt* ſpeaks.

Thus what the *Pſalmiſt* ſays of God, *Worſhip him all ye Gods*, or *Angels*, the Apoſtle attributes to Chriſt; *when he bringeth in the firſt begotten into the World*, he ſaith, *and let all the Angels of God worſhip him.* To this our Author anſwers, *'Tis uncertain whether St.* Paul *had any reſpect to the words in the* Pſalm. What? when he cites the very words, as a Propheſie of Chriſt? How ſhall we then know, when the Apo-

Page 49; 97 Pſalm 7. 1 Hebr. 6.

ſtle has reſpect to the words he quotes? *But if he had, he doth not quote the words of the* Pſalmiſt *as if they were ſpoken of Chriſt, but only declareth the Decree of God (known to him by the Spirit) for ſubjecting the Angels to Chriſt, in the ſame words that the* Pſalmiſt *had uſed upon another occaſion.* But he proves this Decree of God by no other Revelation, but the words of the *Pſalmiſt*, nor pretends any other; and if that don't prove it, we have no other. But his Reaſon for this is admirable, *becauſe they are words moſt proper to expreſs that Decree, for the Writers of the New Teſtament generally affect to ſpeak in Scripture Language:* Which is an effectual Anſwer to all the Texts of Scripture quoted out of the Old Teſtament; that the Apoſtles did not intend to prove any thing by them, but only *affected to ſpeak in Scripture Language*; but when the Apoſtle ſays this was ſpoken of Chriſt, if it were not ſpoken of him, I doubt he affected ſomething worſe than ſpeaking in Scripture Language; this is either to ridicule Scripture, or give the lye to it, let him choſe which he likes beſt.

Page 60. 45 Iſai. 23. 14 Rom. 10, 11. St. *Paul* applies that of the Prophet *Iſaiah*, *I have ſworn by myſelf*, (which all acknowledge to be ſpoken by God) *unto me every Knee ſhall bow*, to Chriſt. This our Hiſtorian ſays, is, *Becauſe Chriſt then and there (at the laſt Judgment) holdeth the place of God, repreſenteth him, and acteth by his Commiſſion. So Men are ſaid to appear before our Sovereign Lord the King, when they appear at the Bar of his Judges, becauſe the Judges act in the King's ſtead, and by his Commiſſion.* But why does he confine this bowing the Knee to *the laſt Judgment?* St. *Paul* indeed gives this as one Inſtance of it, but does not confine it to this, but in the Epiſtle

ſtle to the *Philippians* makes it as large as the Exaltation of our Saviour; *Wherefore God hath highly exalted him, and given him a Name, which is above every Name, that at the Name of Jeſus every Knee ſhould bow, —— and that every Tongue ſhould confeſs that Jeſus Chriſt is Lord, to the Glory of God the Father.* This is what God ſays by the Prophet, *Every Tongue ſhall ſwear to me*; and St. *Paul* to the *Romans*, *Every Tongue ſhall confeſs to God.* And this ſhows, that it is the Perſon of Chriſt to whom we muſt bow the Knee: It is *the Name of Jeſus at which every Knee muſt bow*; *and every Tongue muſt confeſs, that Jeſus Chriſt is the Lord.* Now I ſuppoſe he will not ſay, That we muſt confeſs the Judges to be the King, or that we muſt bow to their Perſons, but to their Commiſſion; or that they repreſent the King, wherever they are, but only in the King's Court. 2 Phil. 9, 10, 11.

If then we muſt bow to the Perſon of Chriſt, and confeſs him to be the Lord, and this be an accompliſhment of God's Oath, *unto me every Knee ſhall bow, and every Tongue ſhall ſwear*; then Chriſt is that God, who in the Prophet *Iſaiah* ſwore, that every Knee ſhould bow to him: And the Prophet plainly deſcribes, who this God is to whom every Knee ſhall bow; *Surely ſhall one ſay, in the Lord have I righteouſneſs and ſtrength*; *even to him ſhall men come, and all that are incenſed againſt him ſhall be aſhamed*; *in the Lord ſhall the Seed of Iſrael be juſtified, and ſhall glory*; And I ſuppoſe all Chriſtians know, who that Lord is, who is *made unto us Wiſdom, and Righteouſneſs, Sanctification and Redemption*; *by whom we are juſtified through Faith in his Blood:* And this is that God, to whom every Knee muſt bow. 45 Iſai. 24, 25. 1 Cor. 1. 30. 2 Cor. 5. 21.

But

But he is a little mistaken also in his Law; we are not said to appear before our Sovereign Lord the King, because we appear before the Judges, who act by the King's Commission; for this is true only of the Court of *King's-Bench*, which is peculiarly the King's Court; though other Judges act by the King's Commission also: In the King's Court we are said to appear before the King.

But now though Christ receive his Kingdom and Power from God, and God is said to judge the World by him, yet it is properly *Christ's Judgment-Seat*: So St. *Paul* here calls him; *We shall all stand before the Judgment-Seat of Christ*; *and we must all appear before the Judgment-Seat of Christ*; *for the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all Judgment to the Son, that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father*; which I explained before. And therefore this being Christ's Court, of which he is the Supreme and Sovereign Judge, to him we must bow our Knee; that is, he is that Lord, of whom the Prophet *Isaiah* speaks.

14 Rom. 10. 2 Cor. 5. 10.

8 Isai. 13, 14.

The same Prophet tells us, *Sanctifie the Lord of Hosts himself, and let him be your fear, and let him be your dread. And he shall be for a Sanctuary*; *but for a Stone of stumbling, and for a Rock of offence to both the houses of Israel; for a gin, and for a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem.* This is evidently spoken of the Lord of Hosts, the God of *Israel*. And this St. *Paul* applies to Christ, that the Jews did *stumble and fall, and were broken*, as the Prophet foretold at this *stumbling Stone: Israel, which followed after the Law of Righteousness, hath not attained to the Law of Righteousness. Wherefore? because they sought it, not by Faith* (the Faith of Christ) *but as it were by the Works*

9 Rom. 31, 32, 33.

Works of the Law, for they ſtumbled at the ſtumbling-ſtone; as it is written, Behold I lay in Sion a ſtumbling-ſtone, and rock of offence; and whoſoever believeth on him ſhall not be aſhamed. Where the Apoſtle joyns two Propheſies together; the firſt, that which I have already quoted, where the Lord of Hoſts is ſaid to be a Stumbling-ſtone, and Rock of Offence: And another of the ſame Prophet; *Behold, I lay in Zion for a Foundation a Stone, a tried Stone, a precious Corner-ſtone, a ſure Foundation: he that believeth ſhall not make haſte*; which both St. *Paul* and St. *Peter* render with the Septuagint *ſhall not be aſhamed.* Now from hence we learn, that the Prophet ſpeaks of the ſame Stone, that *the Stumbling-ſtone* and *Rock of Offence*, is *the Foundation-ſtoue, and precious Corner-ſtone*: And therefore the Lord of Hoſts, who is the Stumbling ſtone, is the precious Corner-ſtone alſo: And St. *Paul* and St. *Peter* tells us, that Chriſt is the Stumbling-ſtone, and that precious Corner-ſtone, of which the Prophet ſpeaks; that is, that Chriſt is *the Lord of Hoſts. To whom* (to Chriſt) *coming as unto a living Stone, diſallowed indeed of Men, but choſen of God and precious, ye alſo as lively Stones are built up a ſpiritual Houſe —— wherefore alſo it is contained in Scripture, Behold, I lay in Sion a chief Corner-ſtone, elect, precious, and he that believeth on him ſhall not be confounded,* or *aſhamed.*

28 Iſai. 16.

1 Pet. 2. 4, 5, 6.

All that our Hiſtorian ſays to this, is, That *neither St.* Paul, *nor St.* Peter *cite the words of the Prophet as ſpoken of Chriſt, but only as in ſome ſenſe applicable to him, namely as Chriſt was to many a Stone of ſtumbling*; which is nothing elſe but to out-face the World with down-right Impudence; and to charge the Apoſtles with abuſing Scripture, and producing Proofs, which

Page 56.

which are no Proofs. St. *Paul* alledges this Propheſie to prove, that the Infidelity of the Jews, and that Offence they ſhould take at Chriſt, was foretold in Scripture; which anſwers that Objection againſt his being the *Meſſias*, that the great Body of *Iſrael*, to whom the *Meſſias* was peculiarly promiſed, ſhould reject him when he came; which had it not been foretold, had been a very unanſwerable prejudice; and yet if Chriſt be not the Prophets *ſtumbling Stone*, this Propheſie does not foretel it. St. *Peter* urges this Propheſie to prove, that Chriſt is the Foundation, Corner-Stone, Elect, and Precious, on which the Church was to be built; but he abuſes us alſo with a ſham Proof, if this Propheſie were not meant of Chriſt. And thus theſe Men, rather than they will allow the Scripture proofs, that Chriſt is God, deſtroy all the Old Teſtament proofs of the Truth of Chriſtianity; and I am afraid they are able to give us no good proof of Chriſtianity without them; and yet if ſuch Texts as theſe muſt paſs only for Accommodations and Alluſions, I know not where they will find any proofs. St. *John* curiouſly obſerves the ſeveral Circumſtances of our Saviour's Death, and ſhows that they were the Accompliſhment of ancient Propheſies; and among others, that of piercing his Side with the Soldier's Spear, which was foretold by the Prophet *Zechary*, *They ſhall look on me, whom they have pierced*, which is confeſſed to be ſpoken of God; and here he tells us again, *That the words in the Prophet are not by St.* John *interpreted of Chriſt, but accommodated to Chriſt and his Sufferings*. And thus, as faſt as he can, one after another, he *accommodates* away all the proofs of Chriſtianity: for we may as well prove the Goſpel out of *Homer*, by accommodating

12 Zech. 10.

19 John 37.

Page 65.

Homer's

Homer's Words and Phraſes to it, and turning it into an *Homerical* Poem, as we know has been done, as prove it by accommodating the Phraſes and Language of the Old Teſtament to it, which were never intended to ſignifie any ſuch thing; this I think is to ridicule and profane both the Old and New Teſtament, and to overthrow the Authority of both.

But I am quite tired with this Work, and therefore ſhall paſs over his other Old Teſtament Proofs; for what can we ſay to convince theſe men, that ſuch Old Teſtament Texts ſpeak of Chriſt, who will not believe the Apoſtles themſelves? and to conclude this, I ſhall only give you a Specimen, how they deal with the New Teſtament alſo, in two or three Inſtances.

I ſhall begin with the Form of Baptiſm; *Go ye therefore and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt.* 28 Matth 19. All the Fathers have made this an Argument, that Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt are One God, becauſe we are baptized in their Name, and we muſt not be baptized in the Name of any Creature; for to be baptized in their Name, ſignifies to be devoted and conſecrated by a Sacred and Religious Rite to the Faith, Worſhip, and Obedience of Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt; and it is Idolatry to joyn Creatures with God in ſo ſolemn an Act of Religion; in the ſame Act whereby we give up our ſelves to God, to give up our ſelves to Creatures, in the ſame Form of words, without making any other difference between them, but the Order of Perſons.

And it is to no purpoſe to diſpute, What is meant by *baptizing in the Name*, for whatever that be, it ſignifies the very ſame to be baptized in the Name of

the Father, and to be baptized in the Name of the Son, and in the Name of the Holy Ghoſt; our Saviour makes no diſtinction, and we muſt make none; and if Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt be not One God, this Form of Baptiſm deſtroys the diſtinction between God and Creatures, and devotes us as intirely to Creatures as to God.

We muſt conſider Baptiſm, as the Sacrament of our Initiation into the Chriſtian Religion, and our Admiſſion into the Goſpel-Covenant, and therefore the Perſons in whoſe Name we are baptized is that God, who receives us into Covenant, and to whoſe Worſhip and Obedience we conſecrate our ſelves. Our Hiſtorian ſays, That *to be baptized in the Name of a Perſon or Perſons: is a Rite by which one delivers himſelf to the Inſtitution, Inſtruction, and Obedience of ſuch Perſon or Perſons: ſo that to be baptized in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, is to profeſs to be led or guided by them, or (as* Grotius *expreſſes this matter) 'tis to declare we will admit of no other thing, as a part of our Religion, but what proceeds from theſe, that is, nothing but what is commanded by God or the Father, and has been delivered by his Son, the Lord Chriſt, and confirmed externally by Miracles, and internally with the Witneſs and Teſtimony of the Spirit, that is by the Power and Inſpiration of God.*

Page 77.

This is a very falſe Account of *Grotius*, and therefore I ſhall conſider it, as his own. Now I readily grant, that Baptiſm does include our Profeſſion of believing the Goſpel, and making that the ſole Rule of our Faith and Worſhip; thoſe who are baptized do own, as *Grotius* ſpeaks, *tres dogmatis ſui Auctores*, Three Authors of their Doctrine or Religion, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt; but then Baptiſm being

ing

ing a Religious Rite, it is a Religious Profeſſion of this, a Religious devoting our ſelves to them, and therefore we give up our ſelves to their Inſtitution and Guidance, not as to Creatures, but as to God, who is both the Author, and the Object of our Faith and Worſhip. No Man muſt religiouſly conſecrate himſelf to a Creature, for that is Idolatry: Even among the Pagans, their Myſteries terminated on their Gods, and they were initiated by them into the Worſhip of that God, whoſe Myſteries they were; and it was never known yet, that Men devoted themſelves to the Inſtitution and Guidance of any Human Doctors or Maſters by Religious Ceremmonies.

Now if Baptiſm be a Religious Rite, God and Creatures can never be made the joynt Object of Religion, and therefore the Son and the Holy Ghoſt, muſt be One God with the Father. I deſire to know what is meant by being baptized *in the Name* of the Father? Is it only to take him for our Inſtructor and Guide? Or is it to worſhip and obey him for our God? And why then do not the ſame words in the ſame Religious Act ſignifie the ſame thing, when applied to the Son and Holy Ghoſt, as they do when applied to the Father? Let them ſhew me any one Inſtance in Scripture, where a Creature is joyned with God in any Act of Worſhip, much leſs in the Fundamental Contract of Worſhip (if I may ſo ſpeak) wherein we devote and conſecrate our ſelves to God.

Our Author with his uſual Aſſurance adds; *'Tis in vain, not to ſay ridiculouſly pretended, that a Perſon or Thing is God, becauſe we are baptized into it, or in the Name of it; for then* Moſes *and* John Baptiſt *alſo would be Gods: Our Fathers were —— all baptized unto* Moſes: *Unto what then were you baptized?* 1 Cor. 10. 1, 2.

19 Acts 3. *and they said unto* John's *Baptism. That is (saith the generality of Interpreters) unto* John, *and the Doctrine by him delivered.*

But in the first place he misrepresents the Argument, which is, that the Son, and Holy Ghost are God, because we are baptized in their Name, as we are in the Name of the Father; and together with him; *in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*; and I confess, he had answered this Argument, could he have shewn us, that the Jews were baptized in the Name of God, and in the Name of *Moses*, for that had joyned *Moses* with God, as our Saviour joyns the Son and the Holy Ghost with the Father in the Form of Baptism.

But he is so far from doing this, that in the next place I observe, that the Jews never were literally baptized in the Name of *Moses*, or in the Name of *John*, as Christians are by our Saviour's Institution in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. *Moses* did not Baptize the Jews at all, much less in his own Name, though St. *Paul* observes, that they had a kind of Mystical Baptism under *Moses* in the Cloud, and in the Sea.

And therefore it is plain, that to *baptize into Moses* is a figurative and allusive Expression, and does not, and cannot signifie, that they were baptized in the Name of *Moses*, because it is not true; for though we should grant, as he argues, that to be *baptized*
6 Rom. 3. *into Christ*, and *baptized in the Name of Christ*, sig-
3 Gal. 27. nifies the same thing, when Men are literally baptized in the Name of Christ, yet is a demonstration, that to be baptized into *Moses*, and baptized in the Name of *Moses*, cannot signifie the same thing; because those who were mystically baptized into *Moses*, never

never were baptized in the Name of *Moſes*; and it is burleſquing Scripture to make any Phraſe and Expreſſion ſignifie that which never was. I will only ask this Author, Whether the Jews were baptized in the Name of *Moſes?* If they were not, let him tell me, how their being *baptized into Moſes* comes to ſignifie their being baptized in the Name of *Moſes?* Could the Apoſtle mean by this Phraſe, that they were baptized in the Name of *Moſes?* that is, could the Apoſtle mean, what he knew was not true.

And yet I deny, that *to be baptized into Chriſt*, and baptized *in the Name of Chriſt*, ſignifie the ſame thing; for to be *baptized into Jeſus Chriſt*, does not relate to the Form of adminiſtring Baptiſm in the Name of Chriſt, but to the effect of it, in uniting us to Chriſt, and incorporating us with him, as Members of his Body, which induces an Obligation of a 6 Rom. 3, 4.
Spiritual Conformity to his Death, in dying to Sin, and living to God. And thus the *Iſraelites* were baptized into *Moſes*, or into the *Moſaical* Covenant, not by being baptized in the Name of *Moſes*, but by myſtical Sacraments; *the Cloud*, which over-ſhadowed and guided them, and *the Red-Sea*, which divided and gave them ſafe Paſſage, but drowned the Ægyptians, being Types and Figures of the Chriſtian Baptiſm; but I ſhall not ſpend time in explaining this now; it is enough to ſhew, that it is nothing to our preſent Argument.

Thus it is evident, that *to be baptized into* John's *baptiſm*, does not ſignifie to be baptized in the Name of *John*, for *John* did not baptize in his own Name, but made Proſelytes to the Meſſias, as the Apoſtle adds; *John verily baptized with the baptiſm of Repentance, ſaying unto the People, that they ſhould be-* 19 Acts 4.
lieve

live on him, who ſhould come after him, that is, on Chriſt Jeſus. Are not theſe now admirable Proofs, that we may be baptized in the Name of Creatures, becauſe the *Iſraelites* were myſtically baptized into *Moſes*, who never literally baptized any, much leſs in his own Name; and that the Diſciples of *John* were baptized into *John*'s Baptiſm, that is into *John*, and that is, in the Name of *John*, which we know he never did. And yet the *Socinians*, who deny the perſonality of the Holy Ghoſt, make this Form of Baptiſm infinitely more abſurd ſtill: The Holy Ghoſt, they ſay, is not a Perſon, but the Power and Inſpiration of God. Now is it not very abſurd, that the Power and Inſpiration of God, which is not a Perſon, ſhould be joyned in the ſame Form with Father and Son, who are Perſons? Is not this like ſwearing Allegiance to the King, and to his Son, and to his Power, or to his Wiſdom? The Holy Spirit is plainly diſtinguiſhed from the Father, and from the Son; and it ſeems, has a diſtinct Name of its own, into which we are baptized; now if the Holy Spirit be not a Perſon, I deſire to know, how the Power and Inſpiration of God is ſo diſtinct from the Father, as to juſtifie our being diſtinctly baptized in the Name of the Father, and in the Name of the Holy Spirit, or of his Power or Inſpiration: To be baptized into the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt, is ſufficient to convince any Man, who is not reſolved againſt being convict, that the Holy Ghoſt is a Perſon, as Father and Son are Perſons; otherwiſe it were very abſurd to joyn the Holy Ghoſt with Father and Son, in ſuch a Religious Dedication as Baptiſm is.

In

In the next place let us conſider the firſt Chapter of St. *John's* Goſpel, which gives a glorious Teſtimony to the Divinity of Chriſt; and a plain demonſtration of the incurable perverſneſs of Hereticks. *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God, the ſame was in the beginning with God.* Our Hiſtorian tells us, *The Expoſition of this Chapter is abſurd and contradictory.* *'Tis this*; *In the beginning*; i. e. *from all Eternity.* Anſw. *From all Eternity, is before the beginning, or without beginning, not in the beginning.* Reply. This is falſe. No man expounds *in the beginning* of Eternity: But when St. *John* tells us, *in the Begining was the Word,* we ſay this proves the Eternity of the Word: For that which *was,* when all things began, which had a beginning, was it ſelf before the beginning, and without beginning: eſpecially when it was ſo in the beginning, that it gave beginning to every thing elſe; that *all things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made, that was made.* 1 John 1,2. Page 80.

Was the Word; i. e. *was God the Son.* Anſw. *But where in Scripture is the Word called God the Son?* Reply. This *Word* indeed is *God the Son,* but we do not Paraphraſe it ſo in this place, *in the beginning was God the Son*; but in the beginning was that Divine Perſon, who is called the *Word.*

The Word was with God; i. e. *The Son was with the Father.* Anſw. *It ſeems then that God in this Clauſe is the Father. But was not the Son alſo with the Holy Ghoſt, and is not he too (according to the* Trinitarians) *God, or a God? If he is, why doth St.* John *only ſay, The Son was with the Father; and how comes the Father to engroſs here the Title*

of

of God to the Excluſion of the Holy Ghoſt?

Rep. This is true alſo; the God with whom the Word was, is the Father, but that is not his Character here neither, no more than the Character of the Word is the Son. But by *God*, the Apoſtle here means that Original Mind and Wiſdom, that Supreme and Sovereign Being, whom all men called God, without making a diſtinction of Perſons in the Godhead.

And therefore, whereas he thinks, that he has got the *Trinitarians* at an Advantage, when the Apoſtle adds, and *the Word was God*, his triumph is vain. *What* (ſays he) *ſhall we do here? was the Word the Father? for ſo they interpreted God in the foregoing Clauſe.* No! no! neither ſo, nor ſo. *The Word was God*, ſignifies the Word was a Divine Perſon in the Godhead: and the Verſe is very plain; *in the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God*, intimately and inſeparably united to him, and that not as a Faculty or Power, as Reaſon is in Human Minds, but as a Divine ſubſiſting Perſon, for *the Word was God.*

God is the Name of a Being abſolutely Perfect, and the Light of Nature teaches us, that there is but One ſuch Supreme Being, or but One God; but Nature does not teach us, that there are Three Divine Perſons, who are this One God; though when Revelation has diſcovered this Myſtery, natural Reaſon is able in ſome meaſure to underſtand it, and ſee the neceſſity of it, as I have already ſhewn; and if there be Three Divine Perſons in the Godhead, Reaſon will tell us, that each Perſon is God, though all Three Perſons are but One God: This is the *Trinitarian* Hypotheſis, and if the words of the Evangeliſt do

do eaſily and naturally agree with this Hypotheſis, and cannot reaſonably ſignifie any thing elſe; that is a ſufficient Argument to me, that this is the true Interpretation of the Text:

In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. That is,

In the beginning of all things was the Divine Perſon, whoſe Name and Character is The Word, *this Word was inſeparably united to that Supreme Being, whom we call God, and was himſelf God, a Divine Perſon ſubſiſting in the Unity of the Godhead; not a Power and Faculty, as Reaſon is in Man.* Can any thing be more eaſie and obvious, and more agreeable to the Doctrine of the Trinity? Or if you change the Subject and the Predicate, as others will have it, and read, *God was the Word*, Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος, it makes no difference at all; for this Supreme Being, whom we call God, was, and is The Word, though not Only the Word: For God is the Father, and God is the Son, and God is the Holy Ghoſt, though God is not only the Father, nor only the Son, nor only the Holy Ghoſt; but the Supreme God, is Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt.

Now when the Evangeliſt had ſaid, That *the Word was God*, or *God was the Word*, there was great reaſon to repeat, *the ſame was in the beginning with God*, which our Hiſtorian thinks *a meer Tautology:* For the intention of it is plain, to inculcate more expreſly on us, that though the Word be God, yet the Word is not all that God is, as *Grotius* well obſerves; for the Word was with God, and therefore a diſtinct Perſon from ſome other Perſon, who is called God, that is, that Eternal and Original Mind and Wiſdom, who is the Father of the Word: And why the Name of Page 82.

God ſhould peculiarly be appropriated to the Father, as the Fountain of the Deity, I have often obſerved.

But yet the Evangeliſt does in this Verſe ſay ſomething more than he ſaid before, and therefore this is no Tautology: He had ſaid, That *the Word was in the beginning*, that it *was with God, that it was God:* now he adds, *The ſame Word was in the beginning with God*; that is, was always with him, never ſeparated from him: And this is added for the ſake of what follows, That the Word was ſo with God in the beginning, that God made the World by his Word: For *all things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made, which was made*; which is another very myſterious Repetition, which nothing can give ſo plain an Account of as our Hypotheſis. *All things were made by him*; this is full enough, without the following addition; nay, indeed ſignifies more, than what follows, in ſtrictneſs and propriety of Speech, ſeems to do: For that *nothing was made without him*, of it ſelf does not ſignifie, that he made all things, but that he had ſomething to do in it; as he may have, who is not the principal Actor. But our Doctrine gives a plain account of this Addition: when the Evangeliſt had ſaid, That this Word, who was with God in the beginning, made all things, there was an obvious Objection: *viz.* Then it ſeems, that God with whom the Word was, did not make the World; if all things were made by the Word: to have attributed the Creation of the World to the Word, ſo as to have excluded God from making the World, had been very abſurd, and contrary to the ſenſe of Mankind; God made the World by his Word; the Word made all things, not ſo as to Exclude God from making

ing the World; and God made all things, but not ſo as to exclude the Word; for without him was not any thing made, that was made: which is exactly what we teach, that Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, as they are One God, ſo they are One Creator, who made the World by One individual Act and Operation. God the Father made the World, and the Creation of all things may eminently be attributed to him, as the Fountain of the Deity, and of all Energy and Power; but he did not make the World without his Word and Spirit: *All things were made by the Word, and without him was not any thing made, that was made.*

This Account is very far from containing any thing abſurd or contradictious; but to have as little diſpute as may be with this Author, let us take it in that ſenſe he would have us take it in; inſtead of *Word* put the *Son*, and inſtead of *God* put *God the Father*, and I can find none of the Contradictions he talks of: for then the words run thus; *In the beginning of all things was the Word the Son of God, and this Son of God was inſeparably united to God the Father, and the Son was One God with the Father; this ſame Son was in the beginning with the Father; for the Father made all things by him, and without him was not any thing made, that was made.*

But let us conſider what Account our *Socinian* Hiſtorian gives of this Chapter: He appeals to *Grotius*'s Interpretation of it, but has miſrepreſented *Grotius*; that did an Action of Forgery lie in theſe Caſes, many Men have loſt their Ears for leſs matters. The Account he gives of it in ſhort is this: *Briefly, the Word (according to* Grotius*) is not an Eternal Son of God, but is here the Power and Wiſdom of God; which Word abiding without meaſure on the Lord Chriſt,* —— Page 88.

'tis therefore ſpoken of as a Perſon, and as One Perſon with Chriſt, and he with that. Whoever will be at the pains to conſult *Grotius*, will ſoon ſee, what credit is to be given to this *Socinian*; but it is no wonder, that thoſe Men pervert Human Writings, who having nothing elſe to value themſelves upon but perverting the Scriptures. But what Agreement there is between this *Socinian* and *Grotius*, I ſhall ſhow in ſome few Particulars, by comparing their Expoſitions with each other; by comparing *Grotius*, as he is repreſented by this Hiſtorian, with *Grotius* himſelf.

	Brief Hiſtory.	*Grotius.*
1 John 1.	*In the beginning.*] *That is, when God created the Heavens and the Earth.*	So alſo *Grotius*. But adds *was*; *jam tum erat*, was when all things began; and ſhows, that among the *Hebrews*, this was a popular Deſcription of Eternity to be before the World, 17 *John* 5. And to this purpoſe applies the words of *Juſtin Martyr* concerning the word προύπαρξε πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων, he was before the Worlds.
	Was the Word.] *The* Hebrews *call, that Power and Wiſdom of God, by which he made the World, and does all other his extraordinary Works, the Word,*	*The Word.*] He owns, it is called the Word in alluſion to what *Moſes* ſays, *That God ſaid let there be Light.* But he calls this *Word, vim,* προβολὴν ἀπόρ-

33 Pſal.

Brief Hiſtory.

33 Pſal. 6. 11 Hebr. 2. 2 Pet. 3. 5. *They borrowed this Expreſſion from* Moſes; *God ſaid, let their be light,* 1 Gen. 3.—— *undoubtedly* Moſes *is not to be underſtood of a Word orally ſpoken; for God is a Spirit; but his meaning is, God put forth his Power and Wiſdom, and thereby created Light and the Firmament,* &c.

This is a direct oppoſition to *Grotius*, whom he pretends to follow, and his Reaſon is as ſilly, as his Authority is counterfeit: For why could not an infinite Mind, beget a ſubſtantial Word, the ſubſtantial Image of his own Power and Wiſdom; and by this Word make the World? and why may not this be repreſented by his ſaying, *Let there be Light?* For ſince he confeſſes, this was not an *oral word*, why ſhould it be repreſented by ſpeaking, or ſaying, if God have not an eternal, ſubſtantial Word, by which

Grotius.

ῥοιαν, Power, Efflux, Emanation, in the ſame ſenſe as the ancient Chriſtians uſed them, to ſignifie a Subſtantial Word, Power, Emanation. In this ſenſe he ſhows, that it is uſed in the ancient Books of the *Chaldæans*, and by the Writer of the *Orphicks*; by *Heraclitus* and *Zeno*, as *Tertullian* and *Lactantius* affirm. Nay, that the *Stoicks*, and *Platoniſts*, and eſpecially *Philo Judæus* uſes it in the ſame ſenſe; who attributes the making of the World to *the Word*, which he calls the Name, the Image, the Son of God. To which purpoſe he before cited *Rabbi Eliezel*, *that God, and his Name, were before the World was made:* and explains this by the ſayings of ſome Fathers, as all meaning the ſame thing, and we know, they meant by it a Divine Perſon.

he

Brief Hiſtory.

he made the World? there muſt be ſome foundation for ſuch forms of Speech, and ſince it is evident, God did not create all things by an oral Word or Command, there is no pretence for this Expreſſion, *God ſaid, Let there be Light*, unleſs there be a Divine Perſon, who is the Word and Wiſdom of God, by whom he made the World; eſpecially ſince this Phraſe of *Moſes* is thus expounded both in the Old and New Teſtament, that God made the World by his Word; which is every where repreſented as a Divine ſubſiſting Perſon.

The Word was with God] i. e. *It was not yet in the World, or not yet made Fleſh; but with God.* So that to be *with God* ſignifies nothing but not to be in the World.

Grotius.

The Word was with God.] *Grotius* does ſay, that this is oppoſed to the Words being made Fleſh, and appearing in the World: but he was far enough from thinking, that theſe words have only a negative ſenſe, that to be with God, ſignifies only not to be in the world: for he tells us, what

The

Brief History.

The Word was God.] i.e. *The Word (or Divine Wisdom and Power,)* (that is, not a substantial personal Wisdom and Power, but such a Faculty, as Reason and Wisdom is in Man) *is not something different from God, but being his Wisdom and Power is God* (as the Wisdom of Man is Man) *'tis the common Maxim of Divines, that the Attributes and Properties of God are God: Which is in some sense true.* The meaning of that Maxim is, that there are no Powers or Fa-

Grotius.

the positive sence is, that *with God* is πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα, with the Father (the very sense which our Historian before rejected as absurd) and explains it by what *Wisdom* says, 8 *Prov.* 30. *Then I was by him, as one brought up with him, and I was daily his delight, rejoicing alway before him*; which he does not think a *Prosopopœa*, but spoken of a subsisting Person.

The Word was God.] Here *Grotius* produces numerous Testimonies to prove that that Divine Person, who is called the Word, not the Faculty of Wisdom and Power in God, is God.

culties

Brief Hiſtory.

culties in God, as there are in created Minds, but God is a pure and ſimple Act, and therefore what are and muſt be diſtinct Powers and Faculties in created Minds, muſt be diſtinct Perſons in the Godhead. And thus whatever is in God is God, as each Divine Perſon is. But if there be diſtinct Powers and Faculties in God, as there are in Men, then the Wiſdom of God is not God, nor the Power of God, God; no more than the Underſtanding is the Man, or the Will the Man, or the Memory the Man.

He adds, *That thoſe Perſons (whether Angels or Men) to whom the Divine Word hath been in an extraordinary degree communicated, have alſo had the Names of Jehovah and God communicated to them.*

Grotius.

He ſays indeed, that the ancient *Hebrews*, and Primitive Chriſtians teach, that when an Angel is in Scripture called *Jehovah*, it is not a meer Angel, *ſed cui adfuerit* ὁ Λόγος, ſuch an Angel, to whom the Word is joyned or united, (not as the Hiſtorian ſays to whom the Divine Wiſdom has been in an extraordina-

Brief Hiſtory

Grotius

ordinary degree communicated; that is an extraordinary wiſe Angel, for there is no other ſenſe in it) but I know not what *Grotius* meant by the Union or Preſence of the Word with the Angel; but I know the Primitive Chriſtians aſſerted, That the Angel called *Jehovah*, was the Word.

Verſ. 2 *The ſame was in the beginning with God*] *This is here repeated by the Evangeliſt, to teach us that the Word is ſo God, that it is not all, that God is; there being other Properties and Attributes communicable, as well as the Word.* So that the Word is but an Attribute of God, and a communicable Attribute, and but one of God's communicable Attributes. So that there may be many *Words*, for *the Word*, as he juſt now ſaid, may be communicated to Angels and Men, in ſuch a degree that the

Grotius aſſigns this Reaſon of the Repetition, that becauſe the Evangeliſt had called the Word God, he would have us underſtand, that he is ſo God, that he is alſo *with God*; that is, that the Word is not all that God is, but only One Perſon in the Godhead: which he obſerves that *Origen*, and others after him, called the Diſtinction of *Hypoſtaſes*, tho' the Primitive Chriſtians, and *Athanaſius* himſelf, uſed that word *Hypoſtaſis* in a different ſenſe; and the Chriſtians ſeemed to take up this ſenſe of it from the

Brief History.

Name *Jehovah* may belong to them; and then why does St. *John* call *the Word* the μονογενὴς, or the only begotten of the Father.

Grotius

Plantonists: But whatever becomes of the Phrase, this is plainly what *Grotius* meant by the Word's *not being all, that is God*, that is, that he is but One Person in the Godhead, not that he is but One communicable Attribute in God.

This is sufficient to show how our Historian has abus'd this Great Man, when he represents him, as making the Word only the Divine Wisdom and Power, not a Divine Person; and all his other misrepresentations depend on this, and need not be particularly examined.

But I perceive our *Socinian* Historian is ashamed of that Exposition which *Socinus*, and his genuine Disciples, give of this Chapter, which had been a sign of some Understanding and Modesty, had he not invented as foolish and senseless an Interpretation himself, for it is not *Grotius*'s, but his own.

Socinus was sensible that *the Word* must signifie a Person, but would allow it to be no more than a Man, called *the Word*, not with respect to his Nature, but Office, as the greatest and most excellent Prophet, who reveals God's will to the world. Our Historian was convinced, that *the Word* must be something Divine, which was with God from the beginning of the world, and was not different from God, but is God, and did create all things at first, and was in a sense In-

Incarnate; *was made Fleſh, did abide on, and inhabit an human Perſon, the Perſon of Jeſus:* So far is very well. But then he will not allow the Word to be a Perſon, but a Divine Quality or Accident, the Wiſdom or Power of God; and the fault of this is, that it is unintelligible Nonſenſe, to deſcribe *the Word* ſo pompouſly, as diſtinct from God, but with God in the beginning, and himſelf God, and to aſcribe the making of the World to him, and tell us, that he was made Fleſh; and all this while the Word is only a communicable Attribute in God, what we call the Faculty of Reaſon in Men: This is a new way of making a God of a *Proſopopœa*, and incarnating a *Proſopopœa*, which muſt be a very figurative God, and Incarnation. But I obſerved before, that when any Vertue or Power or Faculty is ſpoken of as a Perſon, what is ſaid of the Vertue or Power belongs to the Perſon in whom that Vertue and Power is: and what that is ſaid to do, is done by the Perſon, or elſe it is not a figurative but a falſe and abſurd form of ſpeech: As when Charity is ſaid to ſuffer long, and is kind; the meaning is, a charitable man is ſo; a *Proſopopœa* is eaſily underſtood, and conveys its ſenſe clearly and elegantly to our minds; but where there is nothing but Nonſenſe at the bottom, it muſt not be made a figure, for a figurative Speech is good ſenſe: Let us then examine his *Proſopopœa* by this Rule.

In the beginning was the Word, that is the Wiſdom and Power of God; and this Wiſdom and Power of God was with God, that is, God was with himſelf; and this Wiſdom and Power of God, was God, that is, God was God: what ſenſe I beſeech you is there in this?

That the Wiſdom and Power of God made the

World, I grant is ſenſe, becauſe God did make the World; but if there be any ſenſe in *the words being made Fleſh*, it is certain, that God is Incarnate. For the Wiſdom and Power of God, which is with God, and is God, cannot be Incarnate, unleſs God be Incarnate. Unleſs we can divide God from his Wiſdom, and ſeparate the Wiſdom of God, [which was with him from the beginning,] from God, to be Incarnate in Man. The Wiſdom of God can no more be Incarnate, unleſs God can be Incarnate, then the Wiſdom of an Angel can be Incarnate, without the Incarnation of the Angel: and thus this *Socinian* is turned *Sabellian*, and *Patropaſſian*.

However, I confeſs, we are beholden to this Hiſtorian, for he has given up this place to us, which is one of the moſt expreſs places for the Divinity of our Saviour. He allows, that *the beginning* is the beginning of all things; that *Word* ſignifies ſomething Divine; even the Wiſdom and Power of God; that to be *with God*, is to be intimately preſent with him; that to *be God*, is to be God himſelf: That *all things were made by him*, is meant of the firſt Creation of the world; that this Divine Word was made Fleſh, and did abide on the human Perſon of Chriſt Jeſus; the only difference between us is, whether this Word, of whom all theſe things are ſaid, be *a Divine Perſon*, or only *the communicable attribute of Wiſdom and Power in God*; and this after what I have ſaid I leave to any man of common underſtanding to determine.

But what becomes of his beloved *Socinus* all this while? when the very Maſter-piece of his Wit and Invention is rejected by his own Diſciples; for if this *Socinian* be in the right, his Maſter was greatly in the wrong.

By

By the *Word* he underſtands a Perſon, but One who is *the Word*, not by Nature, but Office: by the beginning he underſtands the beginning of *John* the Baptiſt's Preaching; in this beginning the Word was; that is, Chriſt was in being, was in the World, when *John* the Baptiſt began to preach; a great diſcovery; But *he was with God*, known to God only at that time: which is very hardly true; *and was God*, by Dignity and Office, not by Nature. *All things were made by him*, not created; the World was not made by him; but all things are new made by him; that is, all who believe in him, are made new Creatures; and after a great many great things ſaid of this Word, at laſt the Evangeliſt diſcovers this great Myſtery, the *Word was made Fleſh*, that is, the Word was a Man.

If this be not ridiculing Scripture nothing is; I am ſure it repreſents the Evangeliſt very ridiculouſly, to tell the World, that Chriſt, who was half a year younger than *John*, was in the World when *John* began to preach; but how great a Perſon he was, and what his Office was, was then known only to God. Which if it were true, is no great Myſtery; and to ſay this in ſuch a myſterious pomp of words, as there is nothing like it in all the Scripture, is ſuch a vain affectation, as no School-maſter, but an arrant Fop, would endure in a School-boy.

I ſhall not go about induſtriouſly to confute that, which they themſelves begin to be aſhamed of, but ſhall only lay down one Rule of Expounding Scripture, and all other Writings, which is a very reaſonable one, and will eaſily anſwer all the Art and Fallacy which is uſed in this Cauſe; and that is this, to expound all words and phraſes to a proper and literal ſenſe, and to the utmoſt extent of their ſignification, where

where the Circumſtances of the place do not require a figurative and limited ſenſe; if we do not allow this, there is no certain Rule of expounding, but men may interpret according to their own Fancies and Imaginations, to any ſenſe that the word was ever uſed in; and then we may make any thing of any thing, even a good Catholick of *Socinus* himſelf.

Now according to this Rule, *in the beginning* muſt ſignifie the firſt beginning of all things; for that is *beginning* in its utmoſt Latitude, and that is the proper ſignification of beginning, when there is nothing to limit it, and there is nothing here. *Was the Word* muſt ſignifie the Word did ſubſiſt, and therefore is a Perſon; *God* muſt ſignifie *God by Nature*, which is the firſt and proper ſignification of the Word, not a Metaphorical God by Dignity and Office, for there is nothing to incline it to that ſenſe: *All things were made by him, and without him was nothing made that was made*, muſt ſignifie the firſt Creation of all things, when God made the World by his Word; for that is the proper Notion of making all things, to give being to them; and as there is nothing in the Text to require any other ſenſe, ſo its relation to *in the beginning*, when God made all things by his Word, determines it to this ſenſe: This is all true and certain, if it be a good Rule to expound words in a proper ſenſe, when there is nothing that requires an improper and metaphorical ſenſe: And then it is nothing to the purpoſe to ſhow, that *in the beginning*, ſometimes ſignifies the beginning of the Goſpel, that *God* ſometimes ſignifies a metaphorical God, that *making all things* ſometimes ſignifies new making all things, for all this I allow, when the Circumſtances of the place require it, when there is any thing added to determine

determine these words to this sense, but will never allow it, where there is not, and therefore cannot allow it here; and if we must expound these words properly in this place there is an end of this Controversie.

But I must hasten to a Conclusion, and therefore this shall serve at present as a Specimen, how these men pervert Scripture, and impose forced and ridiculous senses on it; and by the help of what I have now discoursed, it will be easie to detect all their other Fallacies, and rescue the Scriptures from their perverse Comments; as I shall be ready at any time to shew, when I find a just occasion for it.

Secondly, *Socinianism*, as reasonable and accountable a Doctrine as our Historian says it is, makes the Jewish Oeconomy very unreasonale and unaccountable. The Jewish Worship was External and Ritual, but very pompous and mysterious, and had there not been something very Divine and Mysterious præfigured by it, it had been no better than a Childish piece of Pageantry, unworthy of the Wisdom of God, unworthy of the Nature of Man. But the New Testament assures us, that all these mysterious Ceremonies were Types of Christ, and were accomplished in him; *in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge*; or in whom are all the hidden Treasures (Θησαυροὶ Ἀπόκρυφοι) of wisdom and knowledge, that is, all those Treasures of wisdom and knowledge, which were formerly hid and concealed under the Types of the Jewish Law; for they were but *a shadow of things to come, but the Body is of Christ*. And yet if Christ were no more than a meer Man, the Antitype falls very short of the Types; I shall instance at present only in the Temple, and its Worship and Ministers. Col. 3. 17.

The

The Tabernacle and Temple was God's Houſe, where he choſe to dwell by the viſible Symbols of his Preſence; and was ſo contrived as to be a Figure both of Heaven and Earth; for ſo the Apoſtle to the *Hebrews* expreſly tells us, that the Holy of Holies was a Figure of Heaven, into which the High-Prieſt only entred, and that but once a year, to make Expiation; and therefore the other Courts of the Temple which were for their daily worſhip, did repreſent the Earth, on which men worſhip God: for God being the Maker and Sovereign Lord of the world, who has Heaven for his Throne, and Earth for his Foot-ſtool, it was fitting the Houſe where he dwelt ſhould be an Emblem and Figure of the whole world.

But we muſt all confeſs, that this was a very unaccountable and inſignificant Ceremony, for God, who fills Heaven and Earth with his Preſence, to dwell in a Houſe made with Hands; to appoint this the peculiar place of his worſhip, ordinarily to accept no Sacrifices, but what were offered there, *&c.* Had it not præfigured ſomething more Divine and Myſterious, *Solomon* in his Prayer of Dedication might well ſay,

1 Kings 8, 27 *But will God indeed dwell on the Earth? Behold the Heaven, and Heaven of Heavens cannot contain Thee, how much leſs this Houſe that I have built.*

The Temple then was a Figure, and we muſt enquire what it was a Figure of. Now a Typical Preſence can be a Figure of nothing, but a real Preſence, and God's Perſonal dwelling among Men: for Preſence and Habitation can ſignifie nothing but Preſence, and a Figure muſt be a Figure of ſomething that is real: and nothing can anſwer to a figurative viſible Preſence of God, but a perſonal viſible Preſence.

Now

Now our Saviour calls his Body the Temple, *Deſtroy this Temple, and in three days I will raiſe it up:* which St. *John* tells us, *He ſpake of the Temple of his Body.* The Temple then, which was God's Houſe, where he dwelt, was but a Figure of Chriſt's Body; Chriſt's Body then was that in truth and reality, which the Temple was but a Figure of; that is, God's viſible Preſence on Earth. But God was not viſibly preſent on Earth, unleſs he were perſonally united to Human Nature; that the Body of Chriſt was the Body of God, or of the Divine Word, by as true and real an Union, as any Man's Body is his. Thus God may be perſonally and viſibly preſent among Men, as a Man, though his Soul be as inviſible as the Deity, is yet viſibly preſent by his Union to a viſible Body: But if Chriſt be not God Incarnate, if the Divine Word be not perſonally united to Human Nature, the Body of Chriſt is but as figurative a Temple, as the Temple at *Jeruſalem* was, and then one Figure is made a Type of another, which is as great an Abſurdity in Types, as a Metaphor of a Metaphor is in Speech. 2 John 19 21.

God was as really preſent in the Temple, as he was in Chriſt without a perſonal Union: for God fills all places, and is really preſent every where, but yet was peculiarly preſent in the Temple to peculiar ends and purpoſes; to hear Prayers, to accept their Sacrifices and Oblations, to give forth his Oracles and Reſponſes; and if Chriſt be but a meer Man, he dwells no otherwiſe in him, but by Inſpiration; and though Chriſt was more perfectly inſpired than the Jewiſh Oracle, this does not alter the Nature of God's Preſence, does not make one a typical and figurative, the other a real Preſence; for God is really

preſent in both, but not perſonally united to either.

The typical Preſence of God in the Tabernacle and Temple is not oppoſed to a real Preſence, by real and ſenſible Effects, but to a viſible Preſence. God is preſent every where, but he is inviſibly preſent; but as he had choſen *Iſrael* for his peculiar People and Inheritance, ſo he would dwell viſibly among them; but this could be done no other way, but either by taking a viſible Body, or by ſome inſtituted ſigns of his viſible Preſence; the firſt he would not do yet, but intended to do in the fulneſs of time, which his own infinite Wiſdom had appointed for it; and in the mean time did prefigure this viſible appearance of God on Earth in Human Nature by ſome viſible Symbols of his Preſence; by a viſible Houſe, wherein he dwelt, by a viſible Throne, or Mercy-Seat; and by placing a viſible Oracle among them: So that the Temple, as a Type, was a Type and Figure of God's viſible appearance and dwelling upon Earth; and therefore if it was a Type of Chriſt's Body, as Chriſt himſelf tells us it was, God did viſibly dwell in Chriſt by a perſonal Union; for nothing elſe can make God viſible, but a perſonal Union to a viſible Nature.

To this St. *John* plainly alludes, when he tells us, 1 John 14. *The Word was made Fleſh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his Glory, the Glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of Grace and Truth*; ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, tabernacled among us, fulfilled that Type of God's dwelling in the Tabernacle, and Temple at *Jeruſalem*, by his dwelling perſonally in Human Nature: Page 87. *And we beheld his Glory*; that is, ſays our Hiſtorian, *the glory of the Man, on whom the Word did abide and inhabit in him:* But St. *John* ſays, *it is the glory of the Word*

Word made Fleſh; the glory of the Word, *as of the only begotten of the Father*, did ſhine in Human Nature; there were viſible ſigns of the Glory of the Incarnate Word: This Glory he ſays, *was beheld in his Miracles, and in his Transfiguration, and on many other occaſions:* very many indeed; in his Life and Doctrine eſpecially; for how would they have the Glory of the Incarnate Word ſeen, but by the viſible Operations of it in Human Nature? How does a Human Soul diſcover its glory but by viſible Actions?

Thus our Saviour tells us, that he is greater than the Temple; *I ſay unto you, in this place is one greater than the Temple:* Now the Temple was God's Houſe and figurative Preſence, and if he were greater than the Temple, God dwelt in a more perfect manner in him; that is, he was not a ſymbolical viſible Preſence of God, which was all he could be, had he been no more than a Man, but a viſible God; even the Lord of the Temple, as the Prophet *Malachi* aſſures us: *Behold I will ſend my Meſſenger, and he ſhall prepare the way before me; and the Lord whom ye ſeek, ſhall ſuddenly come into his Temple: even the Meſſenger of the Covenant, whom ye delight in, behold he ſhall come, ſaith the Lord of Hoſts.* This Meſſenger, all Men own, was *John* the Baptiſt; *The voice of one crying in the wilderneſs, prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths ſtraight.* Now our Hiſtorian confeſſes, he prepared the way for Chriſt: And God ſays, he ſhall prepare the way *before Me*, which proves that Chriſt is this Lord of Hoſts for whom *John* was to prepare the way; but that I at preſent intend is, that he for whom *John* was to prepare the way, is the Lord of the Temple, for it is called *his Temple.* Now

12 Matth. 6.

3 Mal. 1.

3 Matth. 3.

we know, the Lord Jehovah was the Lord of the Temple: For the Temple was God's Houſe, dedicated to his Name and Worſhip; he dwelt in his Temple before by Types and Figures, but now he was to come viſibly and perſonally into his Temple, and therefore he might well ſay, he was greater than the Temple, ſince he was the Lord of it; that Incarnate God, of whom God's dwelling in the Temple was a Figure: and which had been a very empty and inſignificant Figure, unworthy of the Wiſdom and Majeſty of God, had it not prefigured the myſterious Incarnation of the Son of God.

Thus as God had a typical Houſe, ſo he had a typical High Prieſt, and typical Sacrifices. That the High Prieſt, who once a Year entred into the typical Holy of Holies, was a Type of Chriſt, who entred into Heaven, the Apoſtle teaches us, 9 *Hebr.* that the Jewiſh Sacrifices were typical of the Sacrifice of Chriſt's Death; and the ſeveral kinds of them typical of the various Effects and Vertues of Chriſt's Death, we learn every where in the New Teſtament; which, I believe, is the true meaning, *of the Lamb ſlain from the foundation of the world:* not meerly ſlain in God's Decree, for what God has decreed, ſhall be done, is not therefore ſaid to be done before it is done: but this Lamb was ſlain in Types and Figures *from the foundation of the world*; ever ſince the fall of *Adam*, in thoſe early Sacrifices, which were offered after the Fall, which were typical of the Sacrifice of Chriſt; for God had then promiſed, that *the Seed of the Woman ſhould break the Serpents Head*; and for my part, I muſt profeſs, I know no Principle of Natural Reaſon, that teaches us to offer the Blood of Beaſts in Sacrifice to God; and therefore muſt

13 Rev. 8.

muſt think the Sacrifices of Beaſts to be an Inſtitution.

Now that a Human Prieſthood, and the Sacrifices of Beaſts were not acceptable to God in themſelves, the Apoſtle to the *Hebrews* ſufficiently proves; and I would deſire ſome of our Learned, Reaſoning *Socinians* (as they think themſelves) honeſtly to tell me, what account they can give of this Jewiſh Prieſthood, and Sacrifices, which is becoming God: why ſhould God be propitiated by a Man, ſubject to the ſame ſins and infirmities, and very often guilty of them, that other Men are? why innocent Beaſts muſt die to expiate the Sins of Men? When the Apoſtle tells us, that *it is not poſſible, that the Blood of Bulls and Goats ſhould take away ſin.* And yet if there were no more in it, than God's meer Appointment and Inſtitution, I do not ſee, but the Jewiſh Prieſthood and Sacrifices might have been as effectual as any other: I think, they are ſo far in the right, and conſiſtent with their own Principles, that as they own Chriſt to be no more than a Man, ſo they make him only a metaphorical Prieſt, and his Death a metaphorical Sacrifice; for a meer Man can be no more than a metaphorical or typical Prieſt and Sacrifice: but then the difficulty is, how Chriſt is the Antitype to the typical Prieſts, and Sacrifices of the Law, if he be but a metaphorical Prieſt and Sacrifice himſelf; for the Antitype ought to be that in truth and reality, which the Type is a Figure of: And though they were typical, yet they were true and proper Prieſts and Sacrifices, and made a true and proper Expiation for Sin, as far as they reached, and therefore one would think ſhould typifie not a metaphorical, but a true Prieſt and Sacrifice, though of a more excellent and perfect Nature.

Hebr. 8 & 10. ch.

10 Hebr. 4.

Nature. This is eaſily accounted for, if we allow the Divine Word to be Incarnate, and to be our Prieſt and Sacrifice, but without this the Jewiſh Oeconomy is a moſt abſurd and unaccountable Inſtitution.

Thirdly, *Socinianiſm* ridicules the Chriſtian Religion; that is, makes it a very mean and contemptible Inſtitution; which I ſhall ſhew in a few words.

The Fundamental Myſtery of the Chriſtian Religion is the ſtupendous Love of God in giving his own Son, *his only begotten Son*, for the Redemption of Mankind. This our Saviour lays great ſtreſs on; 3 John 16. *God ſo loved the World, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whoſoever believeth in him ſhould not periſh, but have everlaſting life.* By this one would have thought, that Chriſt had been the Son, the only begotten Son of God, before he gave him: as *Iſaac*, who was a Type of Chriſt, was *Abraham*'s Son, before he offered him at God's Command: for that is the Argument of Love, when we part with what we have, and what is dear to us; but this is not the Caſe, if *Socinianiſm* be true; God did not give us any Son he had before, but made an excellent Man, whom he was pleaſed to call his only begotten Son, (though he might have made as many ſuch only begotten Sons as he pleaſed) and him he gave for us; that is, made a Man on purpoſe to be our Saviour. God's Love indeed in redeeming Sinners is very great, be the means what they will; but his Love in giving *his only begotten Son* for our Redemption, which our Saviour fixes on as the great demonſtration of God's Love, is not ſo wonderful, if this giving his Son ſignifies no more than making a Man on purpoſe to be our Saviour.

In

In the next place, the Apoſtles mightily inſiſt on the great Love of Chriſt in dying for us, and his great Humility in ſubmitting to the Condition of Human Nature, and ſuffering a ſhameful and accurſed Death, even the Death of the Croſs. *Ye know the Grace of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, that for your ſakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich: For the love of Chriſt conſtraineth us, becauſe we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead. Let this mind be in you, which was in Chriſt Jeſus, who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made himſelf of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a Servant, and was made in the likeneſs of men, and being found in faſhion as a man, he humbled himſelf, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the Croſs.* 2 Cor. 8. 9. 5. 14. 2 Phil. 5. 6, 7, 8. Now ſuppoſing Chriſt to be but a meer Man, who had no Being before he was born of the Virgin, who knew nothing of his own coming into the World, nor for what end he came; whoſe undertaking was not his own voluntary choice, but God's appointment; where is the great Love, where is the great Humility of this? How did he become poor for our ſakes, who was never rich? *Yes*, ſays our Hiſtorian, *he could have lived in the greateſt Splendor, Dignity, and Plenty. He that could multiply the loaves and fiſhes, and the wine at the wedding of* Cana, *need not have wanted any Comforts of life.* Right! if he can prove that God would have enabled him to work Miracles, to have made himſelf rich and great, and to have miniſtred to Secular Pomp and Luxury, if he had ſo minded; but he being a meer Creature, could work no Miracles, nor to any other ends or purpoſes than God pleaſed; and therefore if by God's Decree he was to live a mean Page 124.

life

life here, and die an accurſed death, and he was made for this purpoſe, he neither ever was rich, nor ever could be rich, and therefore did not make himſelf poor for our ſakes. He could not by the Conſtitution of God have done otherwiſe than he did, if he would be the Saviour of Mankind, and therefore if he was not rich before he came into the World, and voluntarily choſe this Poverty for us, I do not underſtand the great Grace of his becoming poor, for he never was rich, nor ever could be in this World.

Thus what is that Humility our Apoſtle ſo highly commends in our Saviour: For ſuppoſe his *being in the form of God*, ſignifies no more than *being made like* Page 128. *to God*, (as our Hiſtorian will have it) *by a communication of Power over Diſeaſes, Devils, the Grave, the Winds, the Seas*, &c. which dwindles *the form of God* into juſt nothing; for according to them he had no inherent Power to do this, but God did it at his Word, as he did for other Prophets; and therefore this is *no form*, no likeneſs of God at all, for he did not work Miracles, as God does, by an inherent Power, but God wrought Miracles for him; yet ſuppoſe this, how is it an Argument of his Humility, that he *committed not robbery by equalling himſelf to God*, (as he renders the words, which our Tranſlators render, and which the ancient Fathers expound to the ſame ſenſe, *he thought it not robbery to be equal to God*) that is, ſays he, *did not rob God of his honour, by arrogating to himſelf to be God, or equal to God*; though if this were robbery, both Chriſt and his Apoſtles were guilty of it, for Chriſt declared, *I and my Father are One*, which the Jews underſtood (and they did not miſtake him in it) was to make himſelf God; and the Apoſtles do this frequently in expreſs terms, as I have already

already ſhown: But to allow his Interpetation, I only ask, whether Chriſt, if he would, could have committed this Robbery? whether upon their ſuppoſition of his being a meer Man, if he had arrogated to himſelf to be God, God would have permitted this? and ſuffered him to have wrought Miracles, to cheat the world into this belief? if he could not, it is ridiculous to talk of his humility in not doing it; and I am ſure it is ridiculous upon their Hypotheſis, to ſay, that he could.

But *he took upon him the Form of a Servant*; i. e. *became like a Servant, poſſeſſing nothing of his own, and ſuffering injuries and reproaches, &c.* But how did he *take* this form upon him, [which muſt ſignifie his own free and voluntary choice,] when he did not *take* it, but was *made ſo?* This was the Condition, which he did not chooſe, but was made for: and what humility was this, for a meer Man, to be a Miniſter and Servant of God, and ſo great a Miniſter, as to be *in the form of God,* as he ſays, to be glorious for Miracles, and admired as the great power of God, eſpecially when he was to be exalted into Heaven for it, and advanced above all Principalities and Powers? This is ſuch Humility, as would have been Pride and Ambition in the moſt glorious Angel.

But *he was made in the likeneſs of men, and being found in faſhion as a man, humbled himſelf, &c.* that is, ſays this Hiſtorian, *being made like other men in the common ſimilitude of man* (and I pray, how ſhould a man be made, but like a man) *he humbled himſelf, and became obedient unto death*; i. e. *notwithſtanding that, he could have delivered himſelf from them, yet was he obedient even to evil Magiſtrates, and without reſiſtance under-went that death, which their wickedneſs*

Acts 28. *and malice prepared for him*; or rather, which God had decreed for him; *which his hand and counsel determined before to be done*: and therefore which he could not, which he ought not to avoid.

The plain Case is this: All the Circumstances of our Saviour's Birth, and Life, and Death, were so punctually foretold by the Prophets, and so peremptorily decreed by God, that after he was come into the world, there was no place for his choice and election; he could not shew either his love or his humility in choosing Poverty or Death, and therefore if it were matter of his free choice, and a demonstration of his great Humility and Love, as the Apostle says it was, he chose it before he came into the world: He was in the form of God, equal to God, rich, before, and chose to become Man, a Minister, a Servant, and to submit to a mean Life, and an infamous Death for our sakes, and this indeed was a mighty Love and stupendious Humility in the Son of God: This we can all understand: it is a venerable Mystery, and a powerful Argument of our Religion; but *Socinianism* makes Nonsense of it.

The Faith and Worship of Christ is the distinguishing Character of the Christian Religion, and if Christ be no more than a Man, as the *Socinians* teach, it is a direct Contradiction, both to Natural and to the Mosaical Religion, which condemn the worship of any Creature, and all Religious Trust and Affiance in them. It is a Religion without a Priest, and without a Sacrifice, or which is much the same, retains the Name of a Priest and a Sacrifice, without any proper Atonement or Expiation; which is a very unfit Religion for sinners: But that which is most to my present purpose is, that it makes a God of a meer Creature, and makes

makes a Mediator and King without any inherent Power, to ſave Sinners, to protect his Church, to govern or to judge the World, which is a meer Pageant and Shadow of a King

To make a Mediator or Mediatory King, who ſhall be a fit Object of Religious Hope and Truſt and Worſhip (as I have already explained it at large) he muſt have a Perſonal Knowledge of all our particular Wants, and an Inherent Power to help us; and though his Humane Nature is confined to Heaven, his Knowledge and Power muſt extend to all the world; as he himſelf tells us after his Reſurrection, *All Power is given unto me, both in Heaven and in Earth:* particularly, he muſt have Power to protect his Church on Earth from all her Enemies, to reſtrain and govern the malice of Men and Devils, to forgive ſins, to give the freſh Supplies of Grace, to raiſe the Dead, to judge the World, to condemn bad men to Hell, and to beſtow Heaven upon his ſincere Diſciples.

Let us then conſider, what account our *Socinian* Hiſtorian gives of this matter, and what a kind of Mediator and King he makes of Chriſt. Sometimes to abuſe the World, he tells us, *the* Socinians *generally* Page 108. *not only grant, but earneſtly contend, that Chriſt is to be worſhipped and prayed to; becauſe God hath* (they ſay) *by his inhabiting Word or Power given to the Lord Chriſt, a faculty of knowing all things, and an ability to relieve all our wants.* Now if they mean honeſtly, that Chriſt has an inherent Perſonal Knowledge and Power, whereby he knows, and can do all things, this is to aſcribe true Divine Perfections to him, for ſuch are infinite Knowledge, and infinite Power; and that is to make him a true and real God;

and I think, there is not greater Nonſenſe in the World, than a Made God, than a Creature-God, as I ſhowed before: But it is plain our Hiſtorian is none of theſe *Socinians*, for all his Expoſitions lean another way, and in the ſame place he diſputes earneſtly againſt praying to Chriſt, and ſays, that *thoſe Gentlemen* (he muſt mean the *Socinian* Gentlemen, who are for praying to Chriſt, eſpecially the *Polonian* Zealots) *ſay, that Chriſt's Mediation and Interceſſion for us, is not to be underſtood of a Verbal or Perſonal Mediation, proceeding from a particular Knowledge of our Wants and Prayers* (and thus we have already loſt this Faculty in Chriſt of knowing all things) *but he mediates by his Merits; that is* (not by his Expiation and Sacrifice, but (*by the perfect Obedience and moſt acceptable Services, that he has performed to God.* So that theſe *Socinians* are all of a mind as to this matter, that whatever they ſeem to talk of *Chriſt's Faculty of knowing all things, and Ability to relieve all our Wants*, his Knowledge is only by Inſpiration, as the Knowledge of other Prophets is, not an abiding, inherent Faculty; and does not extend to all things, not to the preſent and particular Wants and Neceſſities of his Church, much leſs of every particular Chriſtian, nay, not to the prayers that are made to him; and then I confeſs, I ſee no reaſon to pray to him; and his Ability to help is not an inherent Power to do thoſe things for us, which we need, and which we pray for, but only to intercede for us with God, and that not particularly neither, but only in general, for he does not always know our particular Wants. Chriſtian Ears know not how to bear ſuch talk as this, which makes a Mediator and Mediatory Kingdom an empty inſignificant Name and Title, without any other

Page 111.

other Power but Prayers: And that this is the Mind and Belief of our Hiſtorian, I ſhall now briefly ſhow, and will leave all Men to judge, whether this be not to ridicule the Scriptures and Chriſtianity together.

1. Firſt then let us conſider, what the Knowledge of our Saviour is: and two or three places will ſuffice for this purpoſe, for they are very full and expreſs. St. *John* tells of Chriſt, *He knew what was in man.* To which he anſwers, *The Knowledge which the Lord Chriſt had, or now in his ſtate of Exaltation hath, of the Secrets of mens hearts, is the pure gift of God and revelation from God, and the Divine Word abiding on him:* that is, Divine Inſpiration, for he means no more by *the Divine Word abiding on him:* This is a plain abuſe of the Text, and the Reaſon of it, *He knew what was in Man*, is the Reaſon aſſigned, why he needed no External Information or Teſtimony of Man, *needed not that any one ſhould teſtifie of man*, for αὐτὸς he himſelf *knew what was in man, and knew all men*; which, according to the propriety of words, ſignifies an inherent Perſonal Knowledge, in oppoſition to any External Manifeſtation, and therefore to Revelation it ſelf: for he always knew all men, which cannot be done by Revelation, which is particular and occaſional. But this is not our Diſpute at preſent, but only to ſhow, what this *Socinian* thinks of it. 2 John 25. Page 90.

The ſame he tells us with reference to the laſt Judgment, when Chriſt ſhall *judge the ſecrets of men, the knowledge Chriſt hath, or at the laſt Judgment ſhall have of the ſecrets of hearts, is purely by Revelation from God, and the Divine Word communicated to him.* This he repeats again in anſwer to what Chriſt ſaith 2 Rom. 16. 1 Cor. 4. 5. Page 119.

2 Rev. 23. Page 154. faith in the *Revelation*, *I am he which ſearcheth the reins and heart.* "The knowledge which the Lord "Chriſt had, or hath, of any ones ſecret thoughts, is a "Revelation made to him by God, as it was alſo ſome-"times to former Prophets, — *Prophets ſearch the Heart*, (which was never ſaid of any Prophet, for to ſearch the heart is to look into the heart, and ſee the ſecrets there, not to know them by Revelation) *that is, know the thoughts and propenſions of the heart, by the Spirit or Inſpiration of God in them. But the Lord Chriſt hath a far greater meaſure of that Spirit, than any of the former Prophets ever had:* That is, God reveals more to Chriſt, than ever he did to any former Prophets, but it is only Revelation ſtill, not an inherent Knowledge. *In all theſe places to prove that Chriſt's knowing what is in Man, judging the ſecrets of Men, ſearching the reins and heart*, can ſignifie no more, than that Chriſt has this Knowledge by Inſpiration, he proves from the firſt words of St. 1 Rev. 1. *John's Revelation: The Revelation of Jeſus Chriſt, which God gave to him, to ſhew unto his Servants things which muſt ſhortly come to paſs.* Which does not ſignifie, that this was a Revelation made to Chriſt, but that Revelation which Chriſt made; for though God is ſaid to give it to him, it is to ſhew unto his Servants, that is, by the appointment of God Chriſt 5 Rev. 6. Page 156. ſhewed this Revelation to *John.* Thus when St. *John* ſaw *a Lamb, having ſeven horns, and ſeven eyes, which are the ſeven Spirits of God, ſent forth into all the Earth:* He ſays, *This Text confirms what has been often ſaid, namely, that the Knowledge which our Lord Chriſt now hath of Affairs on Earth, is (partly) by means of thoſe miniſtring Spirits which are ſent forth into all the Earth, as his eyes, to ſee and relate the*

ſtate

ſtate of things: for what other reaſon can they be here called his eyes. I ſhall not now diſpute, what the meaning of this is, it is enough that we know his Opinion, that Chriſt now in Heaven knows nothing of the Affairs on Earth, but either by the Revelation of God or the Miniſtry of Angels; and it ſeems, notwithſtanding *the Divine Word abiding on him*, God does not reveal all things to him, but he is fain to uſe the Miniſtry of Angels to be more perfectly acquainted with the Affairs of his Church. And thus much for his Knowledge; and I confeſs, I deſire a Mediator who knows more, and in a more perfect manner.

2. Let us now conſider his Power, which the Scripture ſpeaks ſo magnificently of, and which Chriſt himſelf calls *all Power both in Heaven and Earth:* and yet our *Socinian* tells us, that this *all Power* is no other Power but Interceſſion; that Chriſt has no inherent Power in himſelf, can do nothing at all, but intercedes with God to do it.

He expreſly tells us, and lays it down as a Principle, that Chriſt's Interceſſion is inconſiſtent with an inherent Power in him, to hear and help us himſelf. *For if he doth hear our Prayers, and can and doth (by a Power conſtantly reſident in him) relieve our Wants, to what purpoſe is he our Mediator with God* —— —— *What can be more evident than that here* (7 Hebr. 25.) *Chriſt's ſaving us from the evils we either fear, or labour under, is aſcribed not to his own inherent Power, but but to his Interceſſion with the Almighty.* Page 110. 111.

Thus Chriſt promiſes to be always with his Church, and a very comfortable Promiſe it is; for we may expect a conſtant protection from him; but our Hiſtorian 18 Matth. 20 28.20.

Page 76. ſtorian tells us, that Chriſt is neither preſent with us, nor can help us himſelf; but *Chriſt is in the midſt of, and is with his People, not by an immediate preſence, as God is, but by his moſt powerful aid and help, which he affords, partly by his continual and ſucceſsful Mediation with God for them all in general; partly by the Angels who are under his Directions, and by him engaged in the defence of the Faithful.* So that Chriſt's promiſe to be always with us, does not ſignifie, that he will be with us, but that he intercedes for us with God, not particularly for you and me, for he knows not what our particular Condition is, but for all in general; and directs the Angels to take care of all the Faithful, and leaves it to their diſcretion, how to do this, for he can only direct, as he intercedes, in general, being ignorant of our particular Condition.

14 John 14. Page 98. Chriſt promiſes, *If you ask any thing in my Name, I will do it*; and for my part I always believed our Saviour could do it, as he promiſed; but he tells us, *the obvious meaning is, if you pray for any thing to God, uſing my Name, I will cauſe it to be done for you, by my Interceſſion.* Well! but will he particularly intercede for us? No; but *the general Interceſſion I will make for all good Chriſtians.*

Nothing is a greater ſupport to Chriſtians under all their Temptations and Sufferings, than to remember, that they have a merciful and compaſſionate High Prieſt, *who is touched with a feeling of our Infirmities, being in all things tempted as we are,* which 4 Heb. 15,16. the Apoſtle urges as a great incouragement to us, *to come boldly to the Throne of Grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need:* But this Argument is loſt, if our High Prieſt does not par-

particularly know what our wants are, nor when we want help, nor does not intercede in particular for us, but only generally for all: And they who are not ſenſible of this, do not conſider the ſtate of Human Nature; for the hope of Sinners is in their Advocate and Mediator, and in his Compaſſion for them; but if he know not their wants, his general Interceſſion gives them leſs hope. And yet this great Conſolation of Sinners is deſtroyed by this *Socinian*, who reſolves all only into a general Interceſſion, That *our High-Prieſt having been in our very Circumſtances, is touched with a true feeling of our Infirmities, and therefore doth with great earneſtneſs intercede for us all in general.* But let us conſider the particular Exerciſe of this Mediatory Power. Page 145.

One glorious Act of Power is to forgive Sins, but this is wholly taken away by our Hiſtorian. Our Saviour challeng'd this Power, while he was on Earth; *The Son of Man hath power on Earth to forgive ſins.* And becauſe our Saviour challenges it, he dares not deny it in plain terms, but expounds it away. He ſays, *God gave this Authority to the Lord Chriſt, becauſe he gave to him alſo to know what was in mens hearts: namely, whether their Repentance and outward Profeſſions were ſincere and laſting*; that is, Chriſt had not a direct Authority to forgive Sins, but a declarative Authority, that their Sins were forgiven upon a certain Knowledge of the ſincerity of their Repentance. 9 Matth. 6. Page 74.

Nay, Chriſt is ſo far from forgiving Sins, that our Author will not allow that they are forgiven in his Name, or for his ſake, as appears from his Paraphraſe on what our Saviour ſays; *That Repentance and Re-*

24 Luke 47. *miſſion of ſins ſhould be preached in his Name. The ſenſe* (ſays he) *is, Chriſt commanded the Diſciples to require men to repent, and on their ſo doing to aſſure them in his Name (or from him) that God would forgive them.* God deliver us from ſuch Expoſitors, who expound away the whole Goſpel of our Saviour.

Another Act of Mediatory Power, which is abſolutely neceſſary to the Chriſtian Church, is to give the freſh Supplies of Grace according to the Needs and Neceſſities of Chriſtians; but though Chriſt repreſents himſelf as a Vine, and Chriſtians as Branches in the Vine, who derive their Spiritual Life and Nouriſhment from him; yet our Hiſtorian will not allow that he can do any thing in this neither, but only intercede with God to give his Grace to us. Thus when *the Apoſtles ſaid unto the Lord, Increaſe our Faith*; his Comment is, *by thy Prayers to God, which are always heard for us.* When St. *Paul beſought the Lord thrice, that it (the Thorn in the Fleſh, the Meſſenger of Satan to buffet him) might depart from him,* and received an Anſwer, *My Grace is ſufficient for thee; for my ſtrength is made perfect in weakneſs.* His Comment is, *He beſought the Lord; that is, he beſought God*; though we know in St. *Paul*'s Epiſtles, *The Lord*, without any other addition, is commonly uſed for the Lord Chriſt. And ſo it is here; where *my ſtrength* is immediately interpreted to be *the Power of Chriſt*, and therefore he adds, *the Power of Chriſt here is the Strength or Power which Chriſt procures by his general Mediation (for all his Church, and every Member of it) with God.* So afraid is he to own, that Chriſt can beſtow Strength and Power on us himſelf to conquer tempta-

15 John

17 Luke 5. Page 80.

2 Cor. 12.8,9.

Page 124.

temptations. But ſtill he was ſenſible, this was to offer force to the words, and therefore ſays, *That the* Socinians, *for the moſt part of them, do grant, that the Word or Power of God abiding on Chriſt, doth qualifie him to hear our Prayers, and to ſuccour us in all Diſtreſſes.* But of this above.

Nay, he will not allow that Chriſt could direct or proſper St. *Paul's* Journey, but only by his general Interceſſion: And *that he cauſeth us to abound in Love,* Page 136. *and all other Graces, partly by his Goſpel, partly by his Interceſſion.* 1 Theſſ. 3. 11, 12.

He denies that Chriſt raiſed himſelf from the dead Page 89. by his own proper Power; and though he ſhall raiſe and change our Bodies at the laſt day, yet it is *by the* Page 93. *Divine Word and Power communicated to him, and abiding on him, by which he raiſed* Lazarus, which he ſays, Chriſt himſelf intimates *was not his own proper Power, but God's; that is, the Fathers.* And leſt this ſhould be thought too much that Chriſt ſhould raiſe the dead, though by his Father's Power, not his own, he adds, *Almighty God can lodge even in dry Bones, a power of reſtoring the dead,* 2 Kings 13. 21. which is a very honourable Compariſon for our Saviour, and ſhows what a mighty Opinion he has of his Power; which is only lodged in him, as it was in the Prophet's dry Bones, and is no more his own Power. But this lodging Power in dry Bones, is a new kind of Philoſophy, and in great requeſt at *Rome.*

To conclude; one would think, that he ſhould leave Chriſt the full Power of Judging the World, ſince *God hath made him Judge both of the quick and of the dead.* But this muſt be expounded away to nothing too. We heard before, that at the day of

Judgment, when he is to judge the ſecrets of Hearts, he knows them only by Revelation from God; and therefore he has no perſonal Qualifications to judge the World, but only bears the Name, when God the Father does the thing: But thus much he allows him;

Page 140. *That Chriſt is ſaid to judge the World, becauſe he ſhall pronounce the Decree and Sentence of God, and order the Angels to execute it.*

And now, has not this *Socinian* made a glorious King and Mediator of Chriſt, without the leaſt Power to do any thing, but intercede by Prayers and Supplications with God, and that without knowing the particular Condition of thoſe, for whom he intercedes. If this be Chriſtianity, *ſit anima mea cum Philoſophis:* If this be to expound Scripture by Reaſon, it is plain that Scripture and Reaſon ſpoil one another; for no Man would reaſon ſo fooliſhly, but to pervert Scripture; nor expound Scripture ſo abſurdly, but to comply with what he calls Reaſon.

4. *Socinianiſm* juſtifies, or at leaſt excuſes, both Pagan and Popiſh Idolatries; at leaſt as it is taught by thoſe Men, who allow of the Worſhip of Chriſt, which it is certain, the Chriſtian Religion teaches: Now if Chriſt be no more than a Man, this is Creature Worſhip, and then Creature Worſhip is not Idolatry; and this goes a great way in juſtifying or excuſing Pagans and Papiſts. If the Worſhip of a Creature be natural Idolatry, God would not have permitted the Worſhip of Chriſt; if it be not, then Pagans and Papiſts are no Idolaters: Though they worſhip Creatures, whatever their Fault be in it, (if it be ſo much a Fault, as a Miſtake) yet it is a Fault of

of a much leſs Nature than Idolatry, and more eaſily pardoned.

Eſpecially when they do not worſhip theſe Creatures as the Supreme God, but as their Mediators, and Patrons, and Advocates with the Supreme God; for there is a Worſhip due to a Mediator, diſtinct from the Worſhip of the Supreme God, as the Worſhip of Chriſt proves, who is not God, but a Creature-Mediator; and thus the Heathens worſhipped their inferior Deities, and thus the Papiſts worſhip their Saints: And if they do miſtake, and worſhip thoſe for Mediators, who are none, and can do them no Service; the greateſt hurt ſeems to be, that they loſe their labour, but according to theſe Principles, they do no injury to God.

For as they tell us, when it is ſaid, *That all men ſhould honour the Son, even as they honour the Father*; *the meaning only is, as we honour God or the Father, ſo we muſt not forget to honour alſo the Son of God*—— *An equality of Honour is no more intended here, than an equality of Perfection in thoſe words, Be ye therefore perfect, as your Father, which is in Heaven is perfect.* So the Heathens did not intend the ſame degree of worſhip to their Mediators and Inferior Deities, as to the Supreme God; and we know the Papiſts diſtinguiſh between the worſhip of *Latria* and *Dulia*, or that Sovereign worſhip which is due to the Supreme God, and that inferior honour to Saints and Angels; and it is plain, this is not an arbitrary, but real diſtinction, as is evident in the worſhip of God, and the Man Chriſt Jeſus, who are worſhipped with different degrees of honour, as theſe *Socinians* aſſert.

5 John 23. Page 92.

And

And whereas the Papiſts are charged with making Gods and Goddeſſes of dead Men and Women, by paying Religious Worſhip to them, they no more make them Gods, than the *Socinians* make Chriſt a God.

And as for the worſhip of the Virgin *Mary*, they have in reaſon as much to ſay for it, as the *Socinians* have for the worſhip of Chriſt: They make Chriſt the Son of God, only becauſe he was formed by a Divine Power in the Womb of the Virgin; but Papiſts, who believe Chriſt to be God, own her for the Mother of God; and I cannot ſee, why it is not as great an honour to be the Mother of God, as to be born of a Virgin by the Power of God, and it may be more. And in reaſon I cannot ſee (allowing of the Interceſſion of a Creature) why the Virgin Mother of God, ſhould not intercede as powerfully for us, as a Man born of a Virgin by the Power of God; and I am apt to think, our Saviour will account it a leſs fault to worſhip his Mother, than to make himſelf a meer Creature.

And though the bleſſed Virgin do not particularly know our Condition, yet ſhe may help us by her general Interceſſion as Chriſt does, and pray particularly for her peculiar Devotoes, and therefore at leaſt we may pray to God in the Name of the Virgin, and other Saints, as *Socinians* do in the Name of Chriſt, who know as little of them.

And yet the Virgin, and other Saints, may underſtand our Condition and Affairs the ſame way, that the

the *Socinians* ſay Chriſt does, *viz.* By Revelation from God, and by the Miniſtry of Angels, who are ſent into the World, and carry the News of this World to Heaven, though we ſhould not allow of their Glaſs of the Trinity, wherein they ſee and know all things.

So that here is nothing wanting but the Appointment and Allowance of God, to make the bleſſed Virgin and other Saints as proper Advocates for us, as the *Socinians* make Chriſt to be; for they are as well qualified for it, or might be, if God ſo pleaſed, according to their Principles; and this the Papiſts think they have too, that God has appointed, or at leaſt allows the worſhip of ſuch favourite Saints; and though they are miſtaken in it, it is certainly a much more innocent and pardonable miſtake, to make a Mediator, whom God has not made, than to make the Eternal Son of God a Creature.

In a word, whatever evil there is in Creature-worſhip, that the *Socinians* are guilty of in worſhipping a meer Man; but this is not the worſt of their Caſe, for they overthrow the whole Chriſtian Religion by it; which Popery does not overthrow, though it greatly and dangerouſly corrupts it.

SECT.

SECT. VII.

An Answer to what remains in the Brief Notes.

I Am now hastening to a Conclusion, and there is little behind to stop me; for though half the Sheet be yet untouched, it is answered before I come to it; and therefore both to save Paper and Pains, I shall not transcribe his long impertinent Harangues, as I have hitherto done, but only give the Reader a view of those Passages, which he intends for Argument or Drollery, I know not whether.

Creed. *The Son is of the Father alone, not made, nor created, but begotten.*

Our Note-maker has discovered a Contradiction between the beginning and the end of this Article; for either *the Son is not of the Father alone*, or *he is not begotten*; *for every Novice in Grammar, and proper Speaking, knows, that begotten, when it is distinguished from made and created, always supposes two Parents, a Mother as well as a Father.* He will allow the Son to be begotten, *if you speak of the Generation of the Son by the Divine Power on the Virgin* Mary; *for then it would have been true, that the Son is neither made, nor created, but begotten*; for then he has both Father and Mother; God is his Father, and the Virgin *Mary* his Mother; and thus, though they will not allow the Virgin to be the Mother, they will allow her to be the Wife of God, which is as honourable

able. Theſe are very fit men to make Addreſſes to a *Morocco* Ambaſſador, for they are ſo far of *Mahomet*'s mind, that God cannot have a Son, unleſs he have a Wife; but *Mahomet* was the better Divine in this, that he never dreamt of God's having a Woman for his Wife. I am afraid this is Blaſphemy; I'm ſure, we have always thought it ſo from the Mouth of a ſcoffing Athieſt or Infidel; for this his not is own but borrowed wit.

For does our Author in earneſt think, that God cannot have a Son, unleſs he begets him, as one man begets another? This is to diſpute againſt God's begetting a Son, as the Epicurean in *Tully* did againſt God's making a World, that he wanted Miniſters and Inſtruments for ſuch a Work, as if God made a World, as a Carpenter builds a Houſe. Does a Son neceſſarily ſignifie one who is begotten of two Parents? I thought the true Notion of a Son had been, one who is produced out of the Subſtance of its Parent, (not out of nothing, which we call *Creation*, nor formed of any other Præexiſtent Matter which we call *making*) and that the true Notion of *begetting*, is to produce its own Image and Likeneſs out of its own Subſtance, by what means ſoever this is done; and if one Parent can thus beget a Son of his own Subſtance, this argues greater perfection in the Father, and is a more perfect manner of Production than by two; and methinks he might allow the moſt perfect Being to beget a Son in the moſt perfect manner. And that an infinite Mind can and muſt beget his own likeneſs and image, that is, an Eternal Son, by a reflex Knowledge of himſelf, I have already ſhewn.

Quæ molitio, quæ ferramenta, qui vectes, quæ machinæ, qui Miniſtri, tanti muneris fuerunt? De Nat. Deor. l. 1.

Supra p. 130.

Creed. *The Holy Ghoſt is of the Father and the Son, neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding.*

His firſt quarrel againſt this, is the Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt, from Father and Son: The next is about the diſtinction between *being begotten and proceeding*, which he ſays are the ſame thing, and are now confeſſed to be ſo, *by the moſt learned Trinitarians*; who theſe are, I know not, but be they who they will, it was no Argument of their Prudence or Learning to reject a diſtinction, which both the reaſon of the thing requires, and the Chriſtian Church has always owned: But this I have accounted for before, and plainly ſhewn the diſtinction between Generation and Proceſſion, the firſt is a reflex Act, whereby God knows himſelf, and begets his own Likeneſs and Image; Proceſſion is a direct Act, that Eternal Love whereby God loves himſelf and his own Image, which proceeds from God, as all Thoughts and Paſſions proceed out of the Heart.

Supra Page 134, 135.

Creed. And therefore there *is but One Father, not Three Fathers, One Son, not Three Sons, One Holy Ghoſt, not Three Holy Ghoſts.* The ſecond Perſon, is indeed the Son of the firſt, but the third Perſon, who proceeds from Father and Son, is not the Son of either; for to proceed is not to be begotten, and therefore there are not *two Sons*, nor *two Fathers*, as this Author affirms; much leſs are they *Three Holy Ghoſts*, though I grant, as he ſays, that *they are Three Holy Spirits.* But this is a meer childiſh Fallacy, and playing with words: as there is but One God, ſo he is

is a holy Being, and a pure Mind and Spirit, as Spirit is oppoſed to Matter; and thus all Three Divine Perſons are holy Minds and Spirits, eſſentially united into One infinite Mind and Spirit; but the Holy Ghoſt, who is the Spirit of the Father and the Son, and a diſtinct Perſon in the Trinity, is but One.

In this Trinity none is before or after other, none is greater or leſs than another. Creed.

Yet the Son himſelf ſaith the Father is greater than I, 14 Joh. 28. And the Son himſelf ſaith, *I and the Father are One,* 10 Joh. 30. And therefore there can be no greater inequality between them, than what is conſiſtent with an Oneneſs and Identity of Eſſence: That is, not an inequality of Nature, but Order, as a Father is greater than the Son, who is naturally ſubordinate to him, though their Nature be equal and the ſame. Though we know, the ancient Fathers underſtood this of Chriſt as Man, as it is alſo expreſſed in this Creed, *Equal to the Father, as touching his Godhead, inferiour to the Father, as touching his Manhood.* He proceeds. *Notes.*

As for the other Clauſe, *None is afore or after other; 'tis juſt as true, as that there is no difference between afore and after. I ask, whether the Son doth not, as he is a Son, derive both Life and Godhead from the Father? All* Trinitarians *grant he does; grounding themſelves on the* Nicene *Creed, which expreſly calls the Son, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made. But if the Father gave to the Son Life and Godhead, he muſt have both, before he could communicate, or give either of them to the Son, and conſequently was afore the Son was. No effect*

is so early as its Cause; for if it were, it should not have needed, nor had that for its Cause. No Proposition in Euclid *is more certain, or evident than this.*

Answer. I hope, he will abate a little of his Mathematical Certainty, before I have done with him; and yet I shall quickly have done with him too. I will begin with his Philosophy of Causes and Effects. *No Effect*, he says, *is so early as its Cause*. Did he never then hear of what we call Emanative Effects, which coexist with their Causes? Is not the Sun the Cause of Light, and Fire of Heat? and can he conceive a Sun without Light, or Fire without Heat? and if he cannot so much as in thought, without absurdity and contradiction, separate these Causes and Effects, is it possible to separate them in time, that the Cause should be before its Effect? that is, that the Sun should be without Light, and the Fire without Heat? and yet, can Light be without the Sun, or Heat without Fire? What becomes then of his Reason, which is as certain and evident as any Proposition in *Euclid*? That *if the Effect were as early as its Cause, it should not have needed, or had that for its Cause.* For Light needs the Sun, and Heat the Fire, for their Causes, and yet are as early as their Causes. But I perceive he is but a young Mathematician or Philosopher, and therefore I would desire him to remember against the next time, *That plain Matter of Fact is as certain and evident as any Proposition in* Euclid.

In all other Causes and Effects, which subsist distinctly and separately, his Maxim is good, That the Cause

Cauſe muſt be before the Effect; but when the Effect is eſſential to the Cauſe, and the Cauſe cannot be without it, there the Effect is as early as its Cauſe, becauſe the Cauſe cannot ſubſiſt without its Effect, as the Sun cannot be a Sun without Light, and Fire cannot be Fire without Heat.

And this is the Caſe here; the Son is begotten by the Father, and is *God of God, Light of Light*, the Holy Ghoſt proceeds from Father and Son; but Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, are eſſentially but One God, and therefore unleſs the ſame One God can be afore and after himſelf in the Trinity, there can be no afore or after, but all Three Perſons are Coeternal, becauſe they are eſſentially One Eternal God: And it is in vain to confound our Minds with conceiving an Eternal Generation, for that is as intelligible as an Eternal Being; we can ſee the neceſſity of both, but cannot comprehend either, no more than we can Eternity. It is demonſtrable, ſomething muſt be Eternal, and it is as certain, that an Eternal Mind eternally knows it ſelf, and loves it ſelf; for there can be no infinite Mind without a reflex Knowledge of himſelf, which is his eternal Son, nor without the love of himſelf and his One Image, which is the Holy Spirit: of which I have ſufficiently diſcourſed already.

And thus we are come to the laſt part of our Task, what concerns the Incarnation of Chriſt, which after all that has been ſaid to prove Chriſt to be the Eternal Son of God incarnate, will take up no great time; for what ever difficulties there may be in the Philoſophy of the Incarnation, or how God and Man is united into One Perſon, it will not ſhake my Faith, who ſee a thouſand things every day which I can give no Philoſophical Account of, and which a little Phi-

Philoſophy would teach conſidering Men not to pretend to give any account of; and yet we believe our Eyes without underſtanding the Philoſophy of things; and why we ſhould not believe a Divine Revelation too, without it, I know not. But let's hear what he has to ſay.

Creed. *The right Faith is, that we believe and confeſs, that our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, the Son of God, is both God and Man.*

Notes. *Then the Lord Chriſt is two Perſons, for as he is God, he is a Perſon.* Very right! *And as he is a Man, he is a Perſon,*; that we deny, that he is a diſtinct Perſon from the Godhead, when united to God. But *a rational Soul vitally united to a Human Body is a Perſon.* Right! when it is by it ſelf; and ſo a Soul without a vital Union to a Human Body is a Perſon; and a Beaſt, which has no reaſonable Soul, but only an Animal Life, as a Man has together with a Human Soul, is a Perſon, or a Suppoſitum, or what he will pleaſe to call it, but it is a diſtinct living ſubſiſting being by it ſelf; but when the Rational and the Animal Life are united in Man, he is not two Perſons, a Rational, and an Animal Perſon, but one Perſon: And therefore we neither need own Chriſt to be two Perſons with *Neſtorius*, (which yet is much more innocent than to deny his Godhead) nor deny him either to be God or Man; for he is God-Man in one Perſon; as a Man is a Reaſonable and Animal Creature united into One Perſon; though we may find the reaſonable and animal life ſubſiſting apart, and when they do ſo, they are two, and but one, when united.

This

This is explained in the Creed by the Union of Soul and Body; *for as the reaſonable Soul and Fleſh is One Man, ſo God and man is One Chriſt:* which he ſays vainly enough, *is the only offer at Reaſon, that is to be found in the whole Creed.* Well! we are glad any thing will paſs with him, though it be but for *an offer at reaſon*, and let us hear how he confutes it.

1. He ſays, *In the Perſonal Union of a Soul with a Body, the Union is between Two finite things: but in the (pretended) Perſonal Union of God to Man, and Man to God, the Union is between finite and infinite, which (on the Principles of the* Trinitarians, I wiſh he had told us, what thoſe Principles are) *is impoſſible: For we muſt either ſuppoſe, that finite and infinite are commenſurate, that is, equal, which every one knows is falſe; or that the finite is united but to ſome part of the infinite, and is disjoyned from the reſt, which all* Trinitarians *deny and abhor.* I beg your pardon Sir! they were never ſo ſilly, as to think of it; but they abhor to ſee ſuch Sacred Myſteries treated with ſo much Ignorance and Impudence.

Since he is for confuting the Doctrine of the Trinity by raiſing Difficulties about the manner of this Union, how God and Man are united into One Perſon; I deſire, he would firſt try his skill in inferiour things, and tell me, how the parts of Matter hang together? which though every body thinks, he knows, I doubt no Body does. Then I would deſire to know, how Soul and Body are united, how a Spirit can be faſtened to a Body, that it can no way releaſe it ſelf, though never ſo deſirous of it, till the vital Union (which no Body knows what it

it is) is diſſolved? Why the Soul can leave the Body, when the Body is diſſabled to perform the Offices of Life, but cannot leave it before? The Soul, I ſay, which we *Trinitarians* believe to be a Spirit, which can paſs through Matter, which cannot be touched, or handled or held, by Matter, and yet feels the impreſſions of Matter, is pleaſed, or afflicted with them, and ſympathizes with the Body, as if it could be cut by a Knife, or burnt with a Fever, or torn by wild Beaſts, as the Body is.

And ſince he apprehends, there can be no Union without Commenſuration, and therefore a finite and infinite Being cannot be united, becauſe they are not Commenſurate; I deſire to know, whether he thinks the Soul and Body are Commenſurate? whether the Soul have parts, as the Body has, which anſwer to every part of the Body, and touch in every Point? Theſe will be very new Diſcoveries, if he can ſay any thing to them; if he can't, it is his beſt way to deny the Union of Soul and Body, becauſe he cannot underſtand it; to aſſert that man has no Soul, but only a Body, becauſe it is impoſſible, that Matter and Spirit ſhould ever be united into one Perſon and Life; which to the full is as unreaſonable, as to deny the Perſonal Union of God and Man, becauſe he cannot underſtand how finite and infinite (which are not Commenſurate, nor can be, becauſe neither a finite nor infinite Spirit, have any parts to be meaſured) can be united.

But in great good Nature, he has found out a *Salvo* for the *Trinitarians*; *That God indeed is infinite, and every Soul and Body (even that of Chriſt) finite, yet the Whole God and the whole Man are united;*

ted; because, as the whole Eternity of God doth Coexist to a moment of time, so the whole Immensity of God is in every Mathematical point of place: And adds, *The very truth is, they cannot otherwise defend the Incarnation, or personal Union of an infinite God to a finite Man.*

This is Gibberish which I do not understand; but this I do understand, (which I suppose is the meaning of it, if it have any meaning) That an Eternal Being, who has no beginning, and no succession of Being, may coexist with time; and that an infinite Mind, who has no parts, or extension, is present every where, without extension: This I have sufficiently discoursed already, and refer my Reader to it. Vide supra, p. 76, 80.

But he has a thundring Argument against this: *But withal it must be owned, that then the Doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation do infer, imply, and suppose all the Contradictions that Mr.* Johnson *has objected to the Doctrine of Transubstantiation?* I hope not all, for that is a very good Discourse, and I only wish for the Author's sake, *si sic omnia*; but pray, what is the matter? *His whole Book, and all his Demonstrations, are founded upon these two Suppositions, That a longer time doth not all of it coexist in a shorter; nor is a greater extension constipated, or contained in a less.* Suppose this, (for I have forgot what his Demonstrations are, and have not the Book now by me) what is this to the Trinity and Incartion? *though a longer time cannot all of it coexist in a shorter,* (which I hope is not so loosly expressed by Mr. *Johnson*, because it is not sense, for Time is in a perpetual flux, and nothing of it exists but τὸ νῦν) but what is this to an Eternal Being's coexisting

with time without time or ſucceſſion? *Though a greater Extenſion cannot be contained in a leſs*, what is this to an infinite Mind's being preſent every where without Extenſion; for here is no Compariſon between a longer and ſhorter time, but between Time and Eternity, which is not Time nor Succeſſion; nor between a greater and leſs Extenſion, but between a finite and infinite Mind, neither of which have any Extenſion. But ſuppoſe the worſt, how does this concern the Doctrine of the Incarnation? If he could tell how to apply all the Demonſtrations of Mr. *Johnſon*, (which he tells us in Print, he forbears to do, becauſe the Preſs is not open to them) theſe Abſurdities and Contradictions would not fall upon the Doctrine of the Incarnation, but upon the Notion of an Omnipreſent God, who has no Parts, nor Extenſion, which was not invented to ſalve the Difficulties of the Incarnation, but is the true Notion of God, and his Omnipreſence, who is not Omnipreſent by Parts, but is every where a perfect and infinite Mind; and if he can ridicule God out of the World, we will quarrel no more about the Incarnation: I do not at all wonder, that he boaſts ſo much, what *Follies and Contradictions* he could diſcover in the *Athanaſian* Creed; for a Man who cannot underſtand common Senſe, can never fail of finding Follies and Contradictions.

2. He proves, *That the Union between God and Man cannot make One Perſon, as the Union of Body and Soul does, becauſe the Union of Soul and Body is not the Union of Two Perſons, but only of One Perſon (the Soul) to a thing otherways without Life, Reaſon, Memory, or Free-will. But in the (pretended) Union of God with Man, there are Two diſtinct and very*

very different Lives, Memories, Reaſons, and Free-wills, which utterly deſtroys a perſonal Union, for that ſuppoſes but One Life, One Reaſon, One Memory, One Free-will.

Now this is falſe as to matter of Fact: For though we will allow the Soul to be the Perſon, yet by its Union to the Body, it has two ſorts of different Lives, Wills, Affections, Appetites, Reaſons; the Animal and Senſual, and the Rational Life, Will, Appetites, a Carnal, and a Spiritual Reaſon; that is, two different Principles of Fleſh and Spirit, as much as if every Man had two Souls.

So that there may be two Lives, two Wills, *&c.* in the ſame Perſon, and it makes no difference in this Caſe, whether theſe two Wills be ſeated in two different Subjects, or the ſame Soul by its vital Union to Matter, have two diſtinct Wills and Reaſons; and therefore we muſt find out ſome other Notion of a perſonal Union than this, *that one Perſon can have but one Will, one Reaſon,* &c. For it is plain, one Perſon may have two Wills and Reaſons, and if he may have two, he may have three, according to the number and diverſity of Natures, which are united into One Perſon.

Now when I inquire what it is that unites different Natures into One Perſon, I do not mean, what it is that naturally unites them; neither what the natural Union is between Soul and Body in the Perſon of Man, nor of God and Man in the Perſon of Chriſt, for this we know nothing of, and therefore no pretended Contradictions and Impoſſibilities in this, ſhall hinder my belief of it; as I diſcourſed in the firſt Section: But how two different Natures

may be so united, as to make but One Agent; for One Agent is One Person.

Now there are but two things necessary to this: 1. That these different Natures be so united, that the superior Nature have the Government of the whole Person; unless there be One governing Principle, there cannot be One Agent, and therefore not One Person, and the superior Nature must be the Governour and the Person: As this Author tells us, the Soul is the Person in Man, as being the superior governing Principle; and in the Soul, Reason has the natural government of Sense, as being the superior Faculty, proper to a Spirit, whereas Sense results from its Union to Matter: And thus in Christ, *the Divine Word* is the Person, and in this personal Union of God and Man, has such a government of Humane Nature, as Reason has over Sense in Man: And therefore St. *John* tells us, That *the Word was made Flesh*, or was Incarnate: For the Person of the Word, took Humane Nature into a personal Union with himself.

1 John 14.

And this is the Reason, why all the Actions and Passions of Humane Nature are attributed to Christ, as the Son of God, because the Word is the Person, to whom Humane Nature is united, and who has the sole government of it; as all the Sufferings and Actions of the Body are attributed to the Man, though the Soul is the Person, because it is the superior and governing Power, and constitutes the Person.

2. To compleat a personal Union, it is necessary there be One Consciousness in the whole: As a Man has a conscious Sensation of every thing, which

is

is done or ſuffered either by Body or Soul; feels its own Reaſonings and Paſſions, and all the Pains and Pleaſures of the Body; and in this Senſe there muſt be but one Life in one Perſon, and this one Conſciouſneſs to the whole, is the one Life.

But then we muſt obſerve, That where different Natures are united into One Perſon, this univerſal Conſciouſneſs to the whole Perſon, is ſeated only in the ſuperior and governing Nature, as it ought to be; becauſe in that the Natures are united into One Perſon, and that muſt govern and take care of the whole. Thus the Mind in Man is conſcious to the whole Man, and to all that is in Man, to all the motions of Reaſon and Senſe; but Senſe is not conſcious to all the Actings of Reaſon, which is the ſuperior Faculty, though it is conſcious, as far as is neceſſary to receive the Commands and Directions of Reaſon; for the Body moves at the command of the Will, and it is ſo far conſcious to its Commands.

Thus in the Perſon of Chriſt, who is God-man, the Divine Word is conſcious to his whole Perſon; not only to himſelf, as the Divine Word, but to his whole Humane Nature; not by ſuch Knowledge as God knows all Men, and all things, but by ſuch a Conſciouſneſs, as every Perſon has of himſelf: But it does not hence follow, that the Humane Nature is conſcious to all that is in the *Word*; for that deſtroys Humane Nature by making it Omniſcient, which Humane Nature cannot be; and its being united to the Perſon of the Word, does not require it ſhould be; for an inferior Nature is not conſcious to all, that is in the ſuperior Nature, in the ſame Perſon.

This

This Union of Natures does require, that the inferior Nature be conſcious to the ſuperior, as far as its Nature is capable, and as far as the perſonal Union requires; for ſo Senſe is in ſome degree conſcious to Reaſon, and it cannot be one Perſon without it. And therefore the Human Nature in Chriſt is in ſome meaſure, [in ſuch a degree, as Human Nature can be,] conſcious to the *Word*, feels its Union to God, and knows the Mind of the Word; not by External Revelations, as Prophets do, but by an Inward Senſation, as every Man feels his own Thoughts and Reaſon; but yet the Human Nature of Chriſt may be ignorant of ſome things, notwithſtanding its perſonal Union to the Divine Word, becauſe it is an inferior, and ſubject Nature. And this I take to be the true account of what our Saviour ſpeaks about the Day of Judgment; *Of that day and hour knoweth no man, no not the Angels in Heaven, but my Father only:* Where our Saviour ſpeaks of himſelf as a Man; and as a Man he did not at that time know the Day of Judgment, though perſonally united to the Divine Word, who did know it; for *as he is the Divine Word*, ſo our Saviour tells us, That *he ſeeth all that the Father doth*, and therefore what the Father knows, the Eternal Word and Wiſdom of the Father muſt know alſo.

24 Matth. 36.

But yet the Human Nature of Chriſt was conſcious to all the actings of the Divine Word in it; as we may ſee in the Story of the Woman, having an Iſſue of Blood twelve Years, who in the midſt of a great crowd of People, came behind him, and touched his Garment, and was immediately healed; our Saviour preſently asked who touched him, and when all denied it, and *Peter* wondered he ſhould ask that Queſtion,

Queſtion, when the Multitude thronged him, and preſſed him; *Jeſus ſaid, ſome body hath touched me, for I perceive that vertue is gone out of me*; he felt the miraculous Power of the Divine Word working in him, as a Man feels what is done in himſelf. 8 Luke 43, 46.

This I think gives ſome account, how God and Man may be united into One Perſon, which though it be a great Myſtery, which we cannot fully comprehend, yet is not wholly unintelligible, much leſs ſo abſurd and contradictious, as this Author pretends.

As for what he adds about *believing and profeſſing* this Faith, let him apply it to Chriſt's being the *Meſſias*, or any other Article of the Creed, and ſee what Anſwer he will give to it; *for what if Men can't believe it? Are we obliged under the penalty of the loſs of Salvation to believe it, whether we can or no? Doth God require of any Man an impoſſible Condition in order to Salvation?* No! but if it be credible, and what a wiſe Man may believe, and what he has ſufficient Evidence to believe, he ſhall be damned, not becauſe he can't, but won't believe it.

But *what if it be againſt a Man's Conſcience to profeſs it?* ——— *if he profeſs againſt his Conſcience, he ſins; and if notwithſtanding this a Man muſt either profeſs or be damned, then God requires ſome Men to ſin in order to their Salvation.* God requires no Man to profeſs againſt his Conſcience; but he ſhall be damned for not believing it, not for not profeſſing what he does not believe: It looks like a Judgment upon theſe Men, that while they can talk of nothing leſs than the ſevereſt Reaſon, they impoſe

impoſe upon themſelves, or hope to impoſe upon the World by the moſt Childiſh Sophiſtry and Nonſenſe.

And now I ſhall leave our Note-maker to harangue by himſelf, and perſuade Fools, if he can, that the Doctrine of the Trinity and Incarnation is nothing but Popery, or muſt be parted with for the ſake of *Jews*, or be made a Complement to the *Morocco* Ambaſſador, and his admired *Mahomet*; or muſt be ſacrificed to Peace and Unity, and to ſecure Men from Damnation, who will not believe. I will not envy him the ſatisfaction of ſuch Harangues, it being all the Comfort he has; for I am pretty confident he will never be able to reaſon to any purpoſe in this Cauſe again.

Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghoſt.
As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever ſhall be, World without end. Amen.

THE END.

ADVERTISEMENT.

A Preſervative againſt Popery, in two Parts; with a Vindication, in Anſwer to the Cavils of *Lewis Sabran* a Jeſuit. 4o.

A Diſcourſe concerning the Nature, Unity, and Communion of the Catholick Church. 4o.

A Sermon Preached before the Lord Mayor, *Novemb.* 4. 1688. 4o.

A Practical Diſcourſe concerning Death. The Seventh Edition. 8o.

The Caſe of the Allegiance due to Sovereign Powers, ſtated and reſolved, according to Scripture and Reaſon, and the Principles of the Church Aof *England*. The Fifth Edition. 4o.

A Vindication of the Caſe of Allegiance due to Sovereign Powers. 4o.

By *William Sherlock*, D. D Dean of St. *Paul*'s. Printed for *W. Rogers*.